



This is a digital copy of a book that was preserved for generations on library shelves before it was carefully scanned by Google as part of a project to make the world's books discoverable online.

It has survived long enough for the copyright to expire and the book to enter the public domain. A public domain book is one that was never subject to copyright or whose legal copyright term has expired. Whether a book is in the public domain may vary country to country. Public domain books are our gateways to the past, representing a wealth of history, culture and knowledge that's often difficult to discover.

Marks, notations and other marginalia present in the original volume will appear in this file - a reminder of this book's long journey from the publisher to a library and finally to you.

Usage guidelines

Google is proud to partner with libraries to digitize public domain materials and make them widely accessible. Public domain books belong to the public and we are merely their custodians. Nevertheless, this work is expensive, so in order to keep providing this resource, we have taken steps to prevent abuse by commercial parties, including placing technical restrictions on automated querying.

We also ask that you:

- + *Make non-commercial use of the files* We designed Google Book Search for use by individuals, and we request that you use these files for personal, non-commercial purposes.
- + *Refrain from automated querying* Do not send automated queries of any sort to Google's system: If you are conducting research on machine translation, optical character recognition or other areas where access to a large amount of text is helpful, please contact us. We encourage the use of public domain materials for these purposes and may be able to help.
- + *Maintain attribution* The Google "watermark" you see on each file is essential for informing people about this project and helping them find additional materials through Google Book Search. Please do not remove it.
- + *Keep it legal* Whatever your use, remember that you are responsible for ensuring that what you are doing is legal. Do not assume that just because we believe a book is in the public domain for users in the United States, that the work is also in the public domain for users in other countries. Whether a book is still in copyright varies from country to country, and we can't offer guidance on whether any specific use of any specific book is allowed. Please do not assume that a book's appearance in Google Book Search means it can be used in any manner anywhere in the world. Copyright infringement liability can be quite severe.

About Google Book Search

Google's mission is to organize the world's information and to make it universally accessible and useful. Google Book Search helps readers discover the world's books while helping authors and publishers reach new audiences. You can search through the full text of this book on the web at <http://books.google.com/>

A 871,657







THE
DUBLIN REVIEW

85062

VOL. V.

PUBLISHED IN

JULY & OCTOBER, 1838.



LONDON:

BOOKER & DOLMAN, 61, NEW BOND STREET,

AGENT FOR IRELAND:

M. STAUNTON, 80, MARLBOROUGH STREET, DUBLIN

EDINBURGH: W. TAIT.

1838.

C. RICHARDS, PRINTER, ST. MARTIN'S LANE.

CONTENTS

OF

No. IX.

ART.	Page
I.—1. Descrizione del Foro Romano, e sue adjacenze, dell' Architetto Cav. Luigi Canina. Description of the Roman Forum, and its Environs. By the Chev. L. Canina, Architect. Rome. 1834. - - -	
2. Le Forum Romain expliqué selon l'état actuel des Fouilles, le 21 Avril 1835. Par C. Bunsen. Rome. 1835.	
3. Annali dell' Istituto di Corrispondenza Archeologica. Annals of the Institute of Archeological Correspondence. Vol. VIII. Nos. II. III. Rome. 1836. -	1
II.—Die Römischen Päpste, ihre Kirche und ihr Staat im Sechszehnten und Siebzehnten Jahrhundert. Von Leopold Ranke. The Roman Pontiffs, their Church and State in the Sixteenth and Seventeenth Centuries. By Leopold Ranke. 3 Vols. Berlin. 1834, 1836. -	14
III.—1. A Grammar of Modern Geography, with an Introduction to Astronomy and the Use of the Globes: compiled for the Use of King's College School. By Aaron Arrowsmith. London. 1832.	
2. Pinnock's Catechism of the History of England; written in easy Language for the Use of Young Persons. Fifty-second Edition. London. - - -	
3. Pinnock's Improved Edition of Goldsmith's History of England. Twenty-fourth Edition. London. 1835.	
4. A Comprehensive Grammar of Modern Geography and History. By William Pinnock, Author of Pinnock's Catechisms, &c. London. - - -	
5. Titi Livii Historiæ Libri omnes qui extant, cum annotationibus probatissimis et utilissimis, accuratè selectis, et Anglicè redditis, à Jacobo Prendeville, Universitatis Dubliniensis Scholare. Tomus Primus, in usum scholarum. Dublinii. 1828. - - -	
IV.—1. History of the Inductive Sciences from the earliest to the present times. By the Rev. Wm. Whewell, M.A., &c. London. 1837. - - -	
2. (Drinkwater's) Life of Galileo. Lib. Useful Knowledge - - -	
3. History of Philosophy. By the Rev. Baden Powell, M.A., F.R.S., Savilian Professor of Geometry in the University of Oxford. London. 1837. - -	72
V.—Minutes of Evidence taken before the Select Committee on the Kinsale Election Petition - - -	116

VI.—1.	The Life of Wallenstein, Duke of Friedland. By Lieutenant-Colonel J. Mitchell. London. 1837.	-
2.	Geschichte des dreissigjährigen Krieges, von Schiller. (History of the Thirty Years' War, by Schiller.)	-
3.	Geschichte des dreissigjährigen Krieges in Deutschland, von K. A. Menzel. Breslau. 1835, 1837-8. (History of the Thirty Years' War in Germany, by K. A. Menzel.	-
4.	Albrechts von Wallenstein, des Herzog von Friedland und Mecklenburg ungedruckte, eigenhändige Briefe herausgegeben von F. Förster. Berlin. 1828, 1829. (Autograph and inedited Letters of Albert de Wallenstein, Duke of Friedland and Mecklenburg, published by F. Förster, Berlin.)	-
5.	Ungedruckte Briefe Albrecht von Wallenstein, und Gustav Adolphi, herausgegeben von E. G. Zober. Stralsund. 1830. (Inedited Letters of Albert de Wallenstein, and of Gustavus Adolphus, published by E. G. Zober.)	-
6.	Wallenstein, Herzog zu Mecklenburg, Friedland und Sägan als Feldherr und Landesfürst. Eine Biographie von Dr. F. Förster. Potsdam. 1834. (Wallenstein, Duke of Mecklenburg, Friedland and Sagan, as a General and Sovereign. A Biography by Dr. F. Förster.)	-
7.	De Alberto Waldsteinio, Friedlandiæ Duce proditore. Commentatio scripsit Rich. Roepell. Halæ. 1834.	142
VII.—	Voyages, Relations, et Mémoires Originaux pour servir à l'Histoire de la Découverte de l'Amérique. Publiés pour la première fois en Français par H. Ternaux-Compans. 6 tom. 8vo. Paris. 1837. Contenant :	
	1. Relation véridique de la Conquête du Pérou et de la province du Cuzco, nommée Nouvelle Castille. Par François Xeréz. 2. Histoire de la Province de Santa Cruz. Par Pero de Magalhane de Gandavo. 3. Commentaires d'Alvar Nunez. Cabeça de Vaca, Adelentado et Gouverneur du Rio de la Plata. 4. Histoire d'un Pays situé dans le Nouveau Monde, nommé Aémrique. Par Hans Staden, de Homberg en Hesse. 5. Narration du Premier Voyage de Nicolas Federmann le jeune, d'Ulm. 6. Histoire véritable d'un Voyage Curieux, fait par Ulrich Schmidel, de Straubing	187
VIII.—1.	The Athenian Captive. A Tragedy, by T. N. Talfourd.	
2.	Woman's Wit, or Love's Disguises. By J. S. Knowles.	224
IX.—	Ensayo sobre la Supremacia del Papa, &c. Lima. 1836.	
	&c. &c.	233
	MISCELLANEOUS INTELLIGENCE.	257
	NOTICES OF BOOKS.	273

CONTENTS


OF

No. X.


ART.	Page
I.—1. Tracts for the Times. 3 vols. London. 1833-6. -	
2. The Works of that learned and judicious Divine, Mr. Richard Hooker. A new edition, with addi- tions, arranged by the Rev. John Keble. Oxford, 1836. - - - - -	285
II.—Questions de Droit Administratif. Par M. de Cormenin, Paris. 1837. - - - - -	310
III.—Shakespeare's Autobiographical Poems. By Charles Armitage Brown. London. 1838. - - - - -	331
IV.—1. The French Revolution, a History, in 3 vols. By Thomas Carlyle. Vol. I. The Bastille. Vol. II. The Constitution. Vol. III. The Guillotine. Lon- don. 1837.	
2. Syllabus of a Course of Lectures on the History of Literature, or the successive Periods of European Culture. By Mr. Carlyle. Delivered at the Mary- lebone Institution in the Months of April, May, and June, 1838.	
3. Sartor Resartus, &c. 1838. - - - - -	349
V.—Memoirs of the Life of Sir Walter Scott, Bart. By J. G. Lockhart, Esq. London. 1838. - - - - -	377
VI.—La douloureuse Passion de Notre Seigneur Jesus Christ, d'après les Méditations d'Anne Catherine Em- merich, Religieuse Augustine du Couvent d'Ague- tenberg à Dulmen, morte en 1824. Paris. 1835.	407
VII.—1. Speeches of Henry Lord Brougham upon questions relating to Public Rights, Duties, and Interests, with Historical Introductions, and a Critical Dis- sertation upon the Eloquence of the Ancients. Edinburgh. 1838.	
2. Opinions of Lord Brougham on Politics, Theology, Law, Science, Education, Literature, &c., with a Memoir of his Lordship's Life. London. 1838,	

	Page
3. Speech of the Right Hon. Lord Lyndhurst, delivered in the House of Lords, on Thursday, August 18, 1836; being a Summary of the Session. 21st Edition. London. 1836.	
4. Speeches of the Bishop of Exeter, on Thursday, March 1, 1838, in the House of Lords, on presenting a Petition from the City of Cork, 2nd Edition; and on July 26, 1838, on the Church Discipline Bill. London. 1838.	
5. Speech of the Bishop of Norwich, delivered in the House of Lords, May 25, 1838, on the National System of Education in Ireland. London. 1838.	
6. Hansard's Parliamentary Debates. Vols. XV to XL. New Series. London. 1833-38.	
7. The Mirror of Parliament. Edited by John Henry Barrow, Esq. Vols. XVIII to XXXVI. London. 1833-38. - - - - -	437
VIII.—1. Historical and Political Essay upon the Belgian Revolution. By M. Northomb. Brussels. 1834.	
2. Belgium and the Twenty four Articles. By M. B. C. du Mortier. Translated by Charles Whyte, Esq. Brussels. 1833.	
3. An Exposition of the Financial System of King William. By G. S. Ansiane. Brussels. 1833.	
4. The Kingdom of the Low Countries. By the Baron de Reverberg. Brussels. 1835. - - -	463
IX.—First and Second Reports of the Commissioners appointed to consider and recommend a General System of Railways for Ireland; presented to both Houses of Parliament by command of Her Majesty. - -	496
X.—1. Father Clement; a Roman Catholic Story. 3rd Edition. Edinburgh. 1825.	
2. The Nun. London. 1836.	
3. The Roman Catholic Chapel; or, Lindenhurst Parish. By Rosina Zornlin. London. 1837.	
4. Geraldine; a Tale of Conscience. 2nd Edition. London. 1838.	
5. Alton Park; the Prize Book. Mrs. Herbert. 1837.	
6. Father Rowland; a Catholic Tale of North America. Dublin. 1837. - - - - -	533
Miscellaneous Intelligence. - - - - -	556
French and Italian Catholic Literature - - -	574

	Page
3. Speech of the Right Hon. Lord Lyndhurst, delivered in the House of Lords, on Thursday, August 18, 1836; being a Summary of the Session. 21st Edition. London. 1836.	
4. Speeches of the Bishop of Exeter, on Thursday, March 1, 1838, in the House of Lords, on presenting a Petition from the City of Cork, 2nd Edition; and on July 26, 1838, on the Church Discipline Bill. London. 1838.	
5. Speech of the Bishop of Norwich, delivered in the House of Lords, May 25, 1838, on the National System of Education in Ireland. London. 1838.	
6. Hansard's Parliamentary Debates. Vols. XV to XL. New Series. London. 1833-38.	
7. The Mirror of Parliament. Edited by John Henry Barrow, Esq. Vols. XVIII to XXXVI. London. 1833-38. - - - - -	437
VIII.—1. Historical and Political Essay upon the Belgian Revolution. By M. Northomb. Brussels. 1834.	
2. Belgium and the Twenty four Articles. By M. B. C. du Mortier. Translated by Charles Whyte, Esq. Brussels. 1833.	
3. An Exposition of the Financial System of King William. By G. S. Ansiane. Brussels. 1833.	
4. The Kingdom of the Low Countries. By the Baron de Reverberg. Brussels. 1835. - - -	463
IX.—First and Second Reports of the Commissioners appointed to consider and recommend a General System of Railways for Ireland; presented to both Houses of Parliament by command of Her Majesty. - -	496
X.—1. Father Clement; a Roman Catholic Story. 3rd Edition. Edinburgh. 1825.	
2. The Nun. London. 1836.	
3. The Roman Catholic Chapel; or, Lindenhurst Parish. By Rosina Zornlin. London. 1837.	
4. Geraldine; a Tale of Conscience. 2nd Edition. London. 1838.	
5. Alton Park; the Prize Book. Mrs. Herbert. 1837.	
6. Father Rowland; a Catholic Tale of North America. Dublin. 1837. - - - - -	533
Miscellaneous Intelligence. - - - - -	556
French and Italian Catholic Literature - - -	574



PLAN OF THE
FORTY ROMANUM
 AS DETERMINED BY THE LATEST EXCAVATIONS
 1838.



RUM.

NIBBY, 1819.

OLDER ANTIQUARIANS.

Clivus Asyli
Porticus Capitolinus

Templum Concordiæ (not excavated)
Templum Jovis Tonantis

Clivus Capitolinus

Porticus Mamertinus

Clivus Capitolinus, see 5 and 6
Porticus Senatûs
Templum Jani
Porticus Septimii Severi

Templum Fortunæ, R. Schola Xantha, B.
Templum Vespasiani et Arcus Tiberii
Porticus Templum Saturni et Ærarium sanctius
Milliarium Aur. in front

Basilica Æmilia

Columna Phocæ. A. Statua Jani. A.R. Statua
Milliarium Parcarum

Tabularium, by Marliano, Fauno, Donati, Piranesi,
Guattani; Tabularium et Athenæum, by Nardini;
Porticus Publicus, by Venuti

Templum Jovis Tonantis, by all the old writers; Tem-
plum Jovis Custodis, by Bufalini

Templum Fortunæ, by Nardini; Templum Vespasi-
ani, by Piale; Templum Concordiæ, by all the rest.

Columna C. Duellii, by Fauno; Græcostasis by Pira-
nesi; Templum Vespasiani, by Venuti; Templum
Jovis Custodis, by Guattani



THE DUBLIN REVIEW.

JULY 1838.

ART. I.—1. *Descrizione del Foro Romano, e sue adiacenze, dell'Architetto Cav. Luigi Canina. Description of the Roman Forum, and its Environs.* By the Chev. L. Canina, Architect. Rome. 1834.

2. *Le Forum Romain expliqué selon l'état actuel des Fouilles, le 21 Avril 1835.* Par C. Bunsen. Rome. 1835.

3. *Annali dell' Istituto di Corrispondenza Archeologica.* Annals of the Institute of Archeological Correspondence. Vol. VIII. Nos. II. III. Rome. 1836.

THERE are few readers of Roman history, we suppose, who have not, in imagination, transplanted themselves to the Forum of the Eternal City. They have probably built it up according to their respective ideas of magnificence: but the leading features of the picture would be pretty generally the same. The Capitol, crowned with its sumptuous temples, at once a sanctuary and a fortress, will overlook the extensive area below; on one side, it will appear cut down, so as to give ascent to the crowds of citizens; on the other, frowning with the dark, beetling precipices of the Tarpeian Rock. The Via Sacra, lined with temples and basilicas, will be seen, either thronged with the gorgeous spectacle of some military triumph, or abandoned to the more amusing scene of Horace and his boar. On one side, we imagine the rostra, with Gracchus or Cicero haranguing an eager multitude; on another, the senate-house occupied by calmer deliberations. But, beyond these leading objects, placed by us often quite at random, we trouble ourselves but little about filling up the large space which the Forum must have occupied, or in locating the many objects which our passage through the classics brings under our notice, as having existed in, or near it. Not so the Roman antiquary, to whom this interesting spot, changing every day its aspects, under the slow but certain influence of the spade and mattock, affords materials for far minuter studies, and much more accurate restorations. This is, indeed, a species of husbandry hardly known beyond the precincts of that city; from which, every year, springs a fresh crop of basili-

cas and temples, columns and pedestals, and, what is still more certain, of theories and controversies.

The revolutions which used to take place in the old Forum, are nothing compared to these that are now daily witnessed in it. In ancient times, the senators or tribunes might change sides; but certainly not the temples: one candidate might jostle another out of his place, but one large building could hardly have been so unneighbourly to its fellow of brick and mortar; one faction might drive the other back, and even out of the sacred precincts; but it would have been unusual, we fancy, for one portico to send another, with all its columns, rank and file, a-packing from the station it had occupied for some centuries: some patriot might put to open shame a turbulent demagogue, but we imagine the ancients never saw the front of one building out-face another, till this one turned its back upon its rival. Yet all such wonderful evolutions have we beheld among the buildings of the Roman Forum,—not unaptly compared by the late Sir W. Gell, to a country-dance, in which temples change sides, monuments cross hands, and columns lead down the middle. We cannot imagine a more dangerous exposure of parental authority to contempt, than would occur, should any gentleman, who had visited Rome only twenty years ago, rummage out his journal, and the notes he made after the most approved guide-books of the day, and proceed in person to show his boys the lions of ancient Rome. Why, the young sparks (we speak experienced) would laugh at the old gentleman's beard, upon hearing his antiquated antiquarianism. He naturally takes them to the Church of Aracæli, on the Capitol, and tells them with great feeling, that this is the site of the temple of Jupiter Capitolinus, and tries to work up their minds to a suitable pitch of enthusiasm. But the rogues have found out in *their* guide-books, that since their papa was last in Rome, the said temple has quietly walked across the area on the top of the hill, and placed itself upon its other extremity, where, by a lucky coincidence, the Archeological Institute has established itself. He descends into the Forum, and points out three columns of beautiful form, composing an angle of a portico, at the foot of the Capitol. These, every body has known from time immemorial as part of the Temple of Jupiter Tonans. (Plan, No. 4.) But, there, every body has been wrong; for now they are considered as part of the Temple of Saturn. Eight other columns stand beside these, which, twenty years ago, you would have taken any wager, belonged to the Temple of Concord, celebrated as the theatre of Cicero's indignant eloquence. But, alas! within the last twenty years the edifice has passed through many transmutations, having been changed,

first by Nibby into the Temple of Fortune, then by Fea into that of Juno Moneta, later by Piale into that of Vespasian, since by Canina into that of Saturn, and, lastly, by Bunsen back again to that of Vespasian, which, for the present, it remains (No. 17.) The hero of a Christmas pantomime could not have endured more changes. Farther on you meet three other columns, supporting a fragment of entablature, justly admired for elegance of form, which every antiquarian, except Nardini and Piranesi, had called the remains of the Temple of Jupiter Stator, till within the last twenty years; when Nibby, in 1819, turned them into the Græcostasis, or hall for the reception of ambassadors; then Fea, in 1827, made them become the Temple of Castor and Pollux; Canina, in 1834, transformed them into the Basilica Julia; M. Bunsen, in 1835, restored them to the Twin-brothers; and a year later took them back, and dedicated them to Minerva Chalcidici, (No. 33.) The Temple of Peace seemed too large and too solidly established a building to be subject to such antiquarian vagaries as these; but even it has lately had its metamorphoses. Nibby was the first of the moderns who laid his daring hands upon it; and, from a temple, turned it into a law-court, under the title of the Basilica of Constantine; Piale, in 1832, called it the Vestibule of Nero; Canino restored it to Constantine; but we believe it will be changed into the Forum Pacis, (No. 56.)

These examples will suffice to convince our readers, that it is as difficult to keep pace with the discoveries of Roman Archæologues, as with the improvements in the steam-engine. If you lose sight of the Forum for five years, you are thrown back upon your studies, and find that you have to begin all over again. If you insist that when you were last in Rome, say three years ago, the Græcostasis was on the left side of the Forum, and that now you see it placed on the right, your antiquarian guide may answer you as Sganarelle does, on a similar complaint respecting his trifling change in the position of the heart: “Oui; cela était autrefois ainsi; mais nous avons changé tout cela.”* But what will travellers of even a recent date say, when we inform them that they are likely soon to lose the entire Forum, which threatens to walk off bodily to another place, leaving the monuments they have considered as belonging to it, to some other occupant. For, Professor Nibby has now, we understand, a theory, that the real Forum Romanum was not a bit where we now place it, but between the Capitol and the Palatine, in the direction pointed out on our plan by the buildings marked Nos. 18, 29, and 54.

* This translocation takes place between the two plans published by Chev. Bunsen in 1835 and 1836. (No. 18.)

As the barns which at present occupy this ground have been purchased by the government, for the purpose of continuing the excavations in this direction, this new idea may be satisfactorily put to proof. And should the learned antiquarian's theory prove true, all those who have feasted their imaginations by their reminiscences of what they imagined to be the Forum, must be content either to return to Rome, to renew or correct them, or must forego the privileges of travellers—and be silent.

But how are all these wonderful changes of systems and opinions brought about? The whole mystery lies folded up in that magical word “excavation.” At Rome, this word supplies matter for grave discussion, and for after-dinner talk; it points out the direction of the walk or the drive; it presents an object of joint-stock speculation, or of individual industry. Nothing could be done at Rome without excavation; it becomes a universal mania. English children soon learn to turn up the soil with their walking-sticks for bits of marble, and to pilfer fragments of mosaic; their parents buy an unopened Etruscan sepulchre, as they would buy a pipe of wine at home, only they have a tolerable chance of finding it empty; noblemen pay in a month three or four years' rent for a patch of ground, twenty times turned up, for the incomparable satisfaction of seeing, day after day, some cart-loads of bricks dug out, the statues for which they are searching having been a century or two in the Museum.

The excavations, however, of real utility, are those conducted by the government, not so much with the expectation of discovering works of art, as with a view to make out the plans of ancient Rome, particularly the Forum. But, first, as to the way in which they are performed. The workmen employed are pensioners on public bounty, who, instead of being shut up in work-houses, receive a small pay, to labour, if it deserve the name, in the open air. They are none of your brawney, square-built men of the pickaxe and barrow. They are a motley race of every age, from the mere boy to the “lean and slippered pantaloons;” arranged in every variety of costume, most of them preserving some remains of cast-off finery about their persons. They wear their hats with a certain air, that, for all its elegance, provokes you to ridicule, and they handle their spades with about as much taste as they would do a loaded rifle. But in one respect they certainly, and almost without exception, prove themselves to be the legitimate inheritors and possessors of the Forum. They are universally a “gens togata.” Any of them would lose caste, did he ply his work during the winter, otherwise than in a long cloak, the drapery of which is artificially arranged round his person, while engaged in his classical toil. It is true, that

their forefathers, on the same spot, used to gather or gird up their cloaks when about to undertake any thing very laborious; but the reader must not, for a moment, suppose, that these gentlemen's work can have any claim to that title. It is, on the contrary, the most delicious example of making toil a pleasure that can be imagined. As each workman brings his barrow to be, not filled, but sprinkled with earth from the trenches, he sits down to converse with his friends of the shovel, who, in the quietest way possible, measure him out his just load. When this is obtained, he follows in the track of his immediate predecessor, and forms another link in the processional train, moving at the slowest conceivable pace. Their very barrows utter a sympathetic creak at every turn of the wheel, and seem to partake of their masters' antipathy to exertion. Their line never proceeds far without a general stoppage. One of the first on it, soon pauses to take rest, or snuff, and arrests the entire train; yet not a murmur of complaint is heard. As after many such interruptions, each labourer reaches his destination, it is probably only to assist in forming an immense mound of earth, which, in three months, must be as quietly conveyed a few hundred yards farther. It is altogether a scene from entomology on a gigantic scale,—men performing the office of ants, without any of their industry. For, by means of the long black trains of workmen, that literally creep along the earth, immense heaps of rubbish are, in time, either carried off, or made up. They certainly are not the "*Ardelionum quædam natio*," mentioned by the classics, as abounding in Rome, and as

"*Multum agendo nihil agens.*"—*Phæd.* ii. 5.

for, on the contrary, by doing nothing, these in the end get through a great deal of work: and, moreover, the characteristic of "*occupata in otio*" must be here reversed, as our men are most leisurely in their occupation.

By such means as these is the great work of excavation performed,—the first and great cause and promoter of new forensic theories in Rome. But it must not be imagined, that every change of nomenclature in a building argues a new excavation, or the discovery of some new inscription, or passage in the classics. The same data to one antiquary give a perfectly distinct result from what another had previously drawn; nay, the same eyes seem to read the same words in a most different sense in different years. Before, however, endeavouring to unravel the intricacies of the modern systems, we must describe the present state of the Forum, in reference to its various excavations. On descending from the Capitol by the Mamertine Prison, (No. 8), by the Clivus

Asyli, which now passes over part of the Temple of Concord, (No. 8), the traveller finds himself on the modern level of the Forum, now known by the name of Campo Vaccino; but still many feet above the ancient pavement. His natural wish is, that the entire area should be uncovered and reduced to the old level. Serious difficulties are opposed to this plan. For as the neighbouring ground has all been raised in similar proportion, the several streets which run into the Forum, would have to rush down a most inconvenient, not to say dangerous, steep, were it dug out to its ancient depth. At the same time, the churches and shops which line it in the direction of the Via Sacra, would be bared to their foundations, and deprived of their present entrances. The government, therefore, has preferred, for the present at least, to make large excavations round the principal ruins, leaving a raised causeway between them, sometimes communicating by arches under it. The work of excavation was begun by the French, and continued under the Papal government. But this went no farther than cutting a trench or pit under the triumphal arch of Septimius Severus, (No. 13), as well as round that of Constantine, which is beyond the precincts at present under examination. The work has been continued unremittingly, though slowly, till the present day. The following is a general view of the excavations as they at present exist. The entire space between the Capitol and the arch of Severus, is laid bare, so that the area covered by (Nos. 2, 8, 4, 5, 6, 13, 14, 15 and 17) with the intermediate streets, are now laid completely open. Another considerable excavation surrounds the column of Phocas, with the three adjoining bases, (No. 22), as far as (No. 16.) This communicates by means of arches with the forementioned one, from which it is separated by a causeway. The remaining area of the Forum, properly so called, is yet covered up, being traversed from the arch of Severus to that of Titus by an alley of trees. There is, however, a partial excavation at (No. 33), to discover the bases of the three columns there standing. The portico of the Temple of Antoninus and Faustina, (No. 36), is completely laid open; and as a small church had been built on or in the temple itself, the front door which was at the modern level, was seen for many years after the excavation, elevated like a window above the new level discovered. Lately a bridge has been thrown over the Chasm, and has made the church once more accessible through the front. At this point the Forum ends; but the excavations have been carried on more extensively and completely beyond its limits. The Temple of Peace, as it is commonly called, (No. 56), has been cleared out completely, and railed in; the platform of the double Temple of Rome and

Venus has been laid bare, with the steps that led to it, (No. 57.) The arch of Titus, (No. 58) has been cleared of all later incumbrances, one of which at least, the *Turris Chartularia*, would, in our judgment, have been better spared demolition, and thoroughly repaired, and from it to the Colosseum, and beyond the arch of Constantine, you walk pretty nearly on the ancient level.

We have perhaps delayed too long giving our readers some information concerning the plan annexed to this article. Having found that it would be hopeless to think of giving any account of the works before us, and of the interesting part of antiquarian topography to which they refer, without some graphic representation, we had no choice except either to give them the bare surface of the Forum, broken only by such monuments as actually remain, or else to select one of the many plans published with the works reviewed, although necessarily executed for a particular system. Having preferred the latter method as more interesting, and presenting a better guide to the eye towards forming an easier idea of the *possible* distribution of this magnificent spot, we could not long hesitate which to select. That of Chev. Bunsen, in 1836, of which ours is an extract reduced to half its dimensions, is at once the most modern, and in point of measurement, we believe, the most accurate. It has been made with great diligence by G. Angelhard, a German architect of great ability. We have called ours an extract from this; because the original contains not only the Roman Forum, but the adjoining ones, now almost entirely built over, of Trajan, Nerva, Augustus, and Julius Cæsar, with the Forum Transitorium, which connected them with the Roman. These lay to the north and northeast of the latter, and were built upon more regular plans and with greater magnificence. But it would lead us too far to attempt any account of them, or of the theories concerning them. We may observe, that the plan we have followed, though bearing the date of 1836, was not published till the following year. Nor does it extend beyond the Basilica of Constantine, or Temple, or Forum of Peace, (No. 56), which, in reality, is beyond the limits of the Roman Forum. But still we have thought it right to extend it to the arch of Titus, (No. 58), both because the writers on the Forum generally include the ground thus far, and because it forms the modern limit of the area commonly known by that name. The preceding remarks will have sufficiently cautioned our readers against imagining that all or great part of the buildings designed on it actually exist, or even may be discovered by their remains. Beyond those already mentioned as excavated, there is only the round temple, (No. 55), now the Church of

Saints Cosmas and Damian, or rather a vestibule to it, that yet stands. We have marked by darker lines in our plan, what remains from antiquity in the buildings laid down in it.

The dimensions of the Roman Forum, at first sight, strike the spectator as inadequate for the purposes for which it was set aside. For, beginning to reckon from the arch of Severus (No. 13) to the temple of Antoninus (No. 26), or the arch of Fabius, opposite to it (No. 46), now destroyed, which all allow to have been the extent of the area in this direction, we have only a length of 630 Paris feet, equal to 590 English feet. As to the other dimension, it would seem probable that it could not extend farther than the Palatine hill, on one side, and the line of buildings on the other; and this will give us a breadth narrowing from 190 to 110 Paris, or from 178 to 103 English feet. Professor Nibby, as well as Fea, considers what we have called the length to be the breadth of the Forum, which, therefore, stretched considerably farther on one side, so as to be a square, according to Vitruvius's rule. But the position of the Palatine hill, and the lines of ancient streets discovered in the excavations, seem to forbid the admission of this theory. Yet not even the whole of this space, small as it must seem for a city so populous as ancient Rome, was available for the purposes of public assemblies. Of the two compartments marked on the area of the Forum, that numbered 41 is supposed by M. Bunsen to be the Comitium, where assemblies for religious and political purposes were held. This was not a building, but only an allotted space. The other (No. 21) is the Forum properly so called, which was given up to the ordinary concerns of life, as a public square. Both the Comitium and the Forum were encumbered by public monuments, which tended greatly to reduce their space. They were naturally the growth of ages, but even from the earliest ages the obstruction must have been great. For in the Comitium there were the sepulchre of Romulus (No. 42), the statue of Accius Navius (No. 38), the Ruminal Fig-tree (No. 39), the statues of the Wolf (No. 43), and of Cloacina (No. 37), and at its upper extremity the tribunal for the hearing of causes, with the altar known by the name of the Puteal Libonis (Nos. 43, 44). Such at least are the positions assigned to these monuments by M. Bunsen in his *last* plan. The Forum, in like manner, was occupied by statues raised in honour of different commanders, which must have greatly narrowed its precincts. Still we believe that the disappointment of a foreigner is as great, when, after having read so much in the papers of the electioneering scenes of Covent Garden, he discovers, on first visiting it, how small is the space on which the

assembled thousands of Westminster have to hear the rostral eloquence of their candidates.

We now proceed to the buildings and principal monuments that surrounded and adorned the Roman Forum; and first we will clear the way by enumerating those which may be considered as certain, or at least admitted by all antiquarians. Their number will indeed be found very small.

No. 1. The *Clivus Asyli*, or descent from the Capitol to the Forum.

No. 2. The *Tabularium* and *Ærarium*, or national archives and treasury. It exists under the modern buildings of the Capitol, and is in great measure cleared out.

No. 3. Temple of Concord. Inscriptions as well as topographical descriptions of the ancients leave no doubt respecting this being the true site of this building. Its area or pavement is uncovered, so far as the modern way from the Capitol will allow.

No. 5. *Schola Xantha*. The term *Schola* applied to these ruins lately uncovered, must be taken in the sense of chambers, in the occupation of notaries, writers, and cursitors, attached to the ediles, and other forensic functionaries. These remains had formerly been laid open, and then had an inscription with the title now given them, which was derived from A. Fabius Xanthus, who repaired the building.

No. 6. *Porticus Clivi*. Tacitus and Livy mention the existence of a portico in this spot, and the late excavations have discovered it. Offices similar to the former probably existed under it.

No. 8. The Mamertime Prison.

No. 13. Triumphal arch of Septimius Severus. The monument being entire, its inscription baffles antiquarian ingenuity to change its denomination.

Thus far we have been engaged rather with the Clivus Capitolinus than with the Forum itself; which as we shall see is much poorer in sure monuments. Two interesting monuments, lately discovered, meet us at this point.

No. 14 is a circular base, bearing a smaller pedestal, on which was a short thick column, found near it, once evidently covered with metal. This, Canina and Bunsen, we think with every probability, determined to have been the *Milliarium Aureum*, so called from the circumstance of its having been gilt. It held the place of Hyde Park Corner, or St. Giles's Pound, in ancient Rome, being the point of departure from which all the miles were measured on the various roads leading from the Capitol.

But as some antiquarians yet dissent from this opinion, we will not venture to class it among decidedly certain monuments.

No. 15. The line indicated by this number represents the remains of a rostrum or tribune for harangues, decorated with pilasters. Canina most happily applied to its illustration a basso-relievo of Constantine's triumphal arch, in which the emperor is represented as addressing the people from a low hustings, having a low balustrade in front, except in the very middle, where the speaker stands. The arches of Tiberius and of Severus are already represented, as is, perhaps, the *Tabularium*. All which answer precisely to this spot of the Forum and to no other. Neither would the form of the platform suit the ancient rostra, of which a clear representation has been preserved for us on a medal of Palikanus.

No. 22. Column of Phocas. This monument of a barbarous age, and of a most undeserving person, stands in the centre of the Forum, as if to mock at the stability of nobler works, and at the vagaries of antiquaries. As the pillar had been stolen from some ancient monument, and was covered above its base by the earth, it had all the appearance of belonging to an edifice; and thus greatly puzzled older antiquaries. The excavations disclosed the inscription on its base, and for once gave them the comfort of certainty and unanimity in their decision.

No. 36. Temple of Antoninus and Faustina. Here again an inscription in large letters on the entablature of the portico yet standing, leaves no room for antiquarian squabbles.

No. 57. The temple of Rome and Venus, out of the precincts of the Forum, may be considered as tolerably certain. The double cella is sufficiently entire, and the groundwork, thanks to judicious excavations, may be accurately traced.

No. 58. The arch of Titus. The same may be said of this monument, so interesting to Christian faith, from its bearing the sculptured representation of the Jewish spoils borne in triumph, after not a stone had been left upon a stone of the devoted temple.

Here we close our lists of certain monuments, a poor proportion to those that remain as yet undecided, matter for endless contests and bewildering theories. The student of Roman antiquities must after this small gleaning from the numerous buildings of the Forum, be content to wander in the dark, or at least renounce all hope of ever coming to any end of his scholarship. About a dozen monuments, out of nearly sixty, may be considered as settled, and almost every one of these by means of inscriptions, remaining upon them, or found amidst their ruins. The earth

has been turned up round them all, so as to leave small hope of farther discoveries for most of them; so that we fear we must come to the inevitable conclusion, that wherever we are left to the forming of our decisions only on the comparison of classical testimonies, we shall have little or no chance of unanimity or security. Let us take an instance or two.

The three columns at the angle of No. 4 had been always called the temple of Jupiter Tonans. The arguments for this nomenclature were such as might, at first sight, appear satisfactory. First we knew from Suetonius, that Augustus erected a temple to this deity, in consequence of a wonderful escape from lightning in Spain. The architecture of this temple is precisely of the age of that emperor. Secondly, Victor, one of the *Regionarii*, or writers who have given lists of the buildings existing in the different districts or *Regiones* of Rome, tells us that he erected it on the Clivus Capitolinus. This temple stands precisely on that spot. Thirdly, a medal of Augustus represents it as fronted by a portico of six columns of the Corinthian order, and the remains of this building exhibit precisely both characteristics. Fourthly, the cornice is decorated by the cap of the priests of Jupiter, crowned with thunderbolts; a device most applicable to such a building, and hardly to any other. Upon the strength of these arguments every writer of any weight upon the Forum had declared the three columns to belong to the Thunderer's temple. But in 1835, Busen rejected, at least tacitly, all these arguments, and, we think upon rather vague grounds, declared them a part of that of Saturn. That there was such a temple *anteclivum Capitolinum, juxta Concordiæ templum*, according to Servius, cannot be denied. But is this assertion sufficient to countervail the various arguments which support the older and more general opinion? Of the inscriptions upon the three temples upon the Clivus (Nos. 3, 4, 17,) given by the Anonymous of Einsiedlin, in the eighth century, two give the titles of the buildings on which they were placed, the temples of Vespasian and Concord, but the third only mentions the restoration of the edifice without naming it. As a question, therefore, of evidence, so far as it is before the public, we are not satisfied that there is ground to change the old name of this ruin. But the consequences of such conflicting opinions go far beyond the individual building they immediately affect, and carry the confusion into all its vicinity. Thus Tacitus tells us that the arch of Tiberius was near Saturn's temple, and consequently the plan of Chev. Bunsen places it across the street, at No. 9, although not the slightest trace is to be found, in the pavement or excavations, of any triumphal arch having stood there. On the other hand

Nibby having called the three columns the temple of Jupiter, has plausible arguments for calling the eight Ionic pillars of No. 17, (now called by Bunsen the temple of Vespasian,) the temple of Fortune. For this is mentioned as being near that of the Thunderer, in an old inscription, and was burnt and repaired under Maxentius, to whose time these columns may well belong, being rudely put together; and, moreover, it is near other points determined by old writers.

However a natural question presents itself here; where have the later theorists placed the temple of Jupiter? We answer they have given it no place at all in the Forum. Now this seems to afford ground for still more serious doubts as to the possibility of any final adjustment of claims between the occupiers of the Roman Forum. For the preliminary step to such settlement seems naturally to be, what buildings are to be admitted into, and what excluded from, its hallowed precincts. It is true that the temple of Jupiter Tonans is spoken of by Pliny and Suetonius as being *in Capitolio*, but others say it was on the Clivus, and the former expression will apply to the latter situation, though this will hardly allow us to place the temple on the hill itself. But what hope can we have that antiquaries will finally agree in allocating the various edifices which adorned the Forum, upon any comparison of classical authorities, so long as these do not bring them to accordance, respecting their very existence in its area? Every side of the Forum will afford us sufficient examples of this strange uncertainty. Fea calls the eight columns of No. 17 the temple of Juno Moneta, of which no trace is to be found in the plans of Bunsen, Nibby, or Canina. Some consider the *Milliarium aureum*, and what was called the *Umbilicus Romæ*, the centre of Rome, as two different objects; others identify them. Fea places the *Templum Martis Ultoris* in the Forum, at No. 11; Bunsen locates it in another Forum; and neither Nibby nor Canina give it any place in their Roman Forum. The arches and temples of Janus in and about this place form another fruitful source of dispute; no two agree even about the number of these buildings to be admitted within it. The basilicas which surrounded the Forum, are far from being decided. The general position of the Basilica Julia (No. 29) on the south side of the Forum, seems pretty well agreed on; but the exact locality differs in every plan. Those of the northern side are more disputed and give rise to complicated arguments. The reasoning of M. Bunsen, by which the Basilica Fulvia and Æmilia (20) is only one building, and distinct from a second Basilica Æmilia (30), yet so that these two communicated together, and might be called a single edifice (19), under the

denomination of the Basilica Pauli, is ingenious, and receives confirmation from the Capitoline fragments of the plan of Rome, which have preserved the form of this double basilica. But it is, we think a bold theory, likely to be severely contested. At least it gets rid of part of a serious difficulty in Roman topography—the disposal of so many basilicas as are placed by ancient writers round the Forum.

To give, by mere description, an adequate idea of the various schemes of the Forum Romanum, would be an endless and difficult task. We have, therefore, preferred to give our readers a tabular view, referable to the plan we have presented him. By it he will in a short time be able to trace the differences between different writers; remembering always that each one of course gives a different disposition to the buildings, as he does a different name. The first column contains Bunsen's plan of 1836, which we give reduced; the second his of the preceding year; the third Canina's of 1834; the fourth Fea's of 1827; and the fifth Nibby's of 1819. We have thrown into another column the opinions of older writers, inclusive of Piale's, whose researches were too limited to fill a separate column. Where the allocation of any building in one of the plans did not correspond exactly to an edifice marked in the plan, it is distinguished by an asterisk, to signify that it is placed by the author in the vicinity of that numbered opposite to it in the table, and the letters A, B, R, L, which follow the sign, denote the edifice in question to be situated *above*, *below*, to the *right*, or to the *left*, of the one indicated by the number.*

Our readers are now in possession of all the information that a limited article could convey, concerning the various theories to which this most fruitful field of speculation has given rise. We shall appear to have written rather as sceptics than as enthusiasts upon the subject; as inclined more to halt undecided between the many systems, than to yield ourselves up to the partisanship of any. We have been duped too often to act otherwise. We have indulged too frequently in admiration and romance, based upon theories which have proved false, not rather to ground our feelings, for the future, upon the grander consciousness that we have walked over the tomb of the republic's liberties and of the empire's magnificence, than upon the more curious fancies, that we this day stood in the ruins of the Senate-house, or that day meditated upon a broken column of some individual temple.

* Vide table, which accompanies the plan of the Forum, as shown at the beginning of this Number.

When a philosopher paces the field of former battles, he would be teased by the petty impertinence of one who ever wished to learn whether each mound contained the ashes of a greater officer or of a common soldier. The scenes which one day passed upon the spot, its ardent passions, its desperate struggles, its numerous death-gasps, its unheeded miseries; then its boisterous exultation and its triumphal shouts; contrasted with the mournful silence to which all has been reduced, and the quiet ascendancy which a higher order of laws has once more gained, making that very ruin of so many subservient to the increase of the fertility they regulate,—would exclude from his mind all desire to obtain minute acquaintance with details that could diminish his impressions by distracting and bewildering his mind. In this spirit we would advise the traveller to contemplate the ruins of ancient Rome, and particularly its Forum. Let him meditate rather than theorize, reflect more than study. To us a broken pillar is more eloquent than the entire Rostra, and the roofless area of a Senate-house speaks better than the tongue of Tullius, when he declaimed amidst the assembled fathers. The very consideration how the most magnificent buildings have lost even their names is to us worth a volume of discoveries; for it is the greatest of possible triumphs obtained by the destroying power over the ambition of man. Where could this anxious feeling have better hoped to secure its memorials than by inscribing them in bronze letters upon marble entablatures? Yet both inscription and building shortly fell, and left the proud and magnificent erection without a record! And had not religion interposed between time and his legitimate prey, scarcely a trace would now have remained to draw the traveller over the Capitol. The few fragments that remain she snatched out of its very jaws, and saved by consecrating to her own uses. Such her power ever appears, as that of a preserving power, a repairer of devastation, and the builder up of ruins which men's evil passions have made.

ART. II.—*Die Römischen Päpste, ihre Kirche und ihr Staat im Sechszehnten und Siebzehnten Jahrhundert.* Von Leopold Ranke. *The Roman Pontiffs, their Church and State in the Sixteenth and Seventeenth Centuries.* By Leopold Ranke. 3 Vols. Berlin. 1834, 1836.

THERE is scarcely any portion of history that has been more neglected or less generally understood than the history of the Popes, who have occupied the Holy See, since the so-called Reformation. Protestant and even Catholic writers, who are

the oracles of the reading public, have not always been acquainted with the authentic sources from which this history ought to be drawn; and still more frequently, under the bias of religious or political fanaticism, the truth has been disfigured by them. The defenders of Catholicism have always been active in refuting their calumnies with solid proofs; but their works have, in general, been too learned, or too little known out of their own country, to destroy the influence of their ingenious adversaries, whose works are, in many cases, superior in point of style and composition. Thus it has happened, that in the opinion of Protestants, all this period of the history of the Apostolic Pontiffs is distinguished by avarice, perfidy, superstition, Jesuitism, and the Inquisition; and even many Catholics give up the defence of too many of the Popes, and entrench themselves on the impregnable position, that the Church which Christ built upon a rock, cannot suffer from the misconduct of some of its chiefs; knowing, at the same time, that the personal virtues of the successors of St. Peter naturally add splendour to the Church.

In this state of things, all new researches concerning this period, from original authorities, are an addition to our historical knowledge; and we have great pleasure in bringing before the notice of our readers, the history of the Popes during the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries, lately published by M. Ranke, Professor of History in the University of Berlin. The importance of the subject, will, we trust, justify us in giving a full account of the whole work; after which, we propose to add a few remarks on different portions of it.

Although the professed object of the work before us, is to give the history of the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries, M. Ranke has very properly commenced with an account of the Holy See in the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries, as they form the epoch of transition from which the sixteenth century arose. In the first centuries of the middle ages, the Pope was universally acknowledged to be the common father of all Christendom; his voice was heard and obeyed among the most distant nations. This unity was injured, when the Emperor of Germany, the temporal head of Christians, began to oppose the Popes. This opposition was carried on by the Emperors of the House of Hohenstaufen; and became more serious afterwards, when, at the accession of the House of Habsburg, the emperors forgot their former elevated position, and thought only of maintaining and establishing the private power of their own families. The removal of the Holy See to Avignon, and the schisms to which it gave birth, were a mortal blow to that influence which they had hitherto exercised over every event that had taken place

throughout Christendom. The Council of Constance ended the schism; but unity was only outwardly restored. Kings and nations continued to seek their individual interests, and possessed themselves of many rights and privileges which had previously been reserved to the Popes; and those mutual notions and feelings that had formed the bond of Christians completely disappeared.

“Whoever wishes to be convinced of this, need only recall to his recollection the zeal which carried every one to the holy sepulchre in former times, and compare it with the coldness with which, in the fifteenth century, every exhortation to join in common against the Turks, was received. Æneas Sylvius, before the Diet of the Empire, and the friar Capistrano in public exhortations to the people, used every effort of eloquence to produce this union, and much has been said of the impression which they made; but still we do not find that any one took up arms in the cause. The Popes strained every nerve; one of them manned a fleet; another, Pius II, the same Æneas Sylvius, weak and sinking into his grave, was carried to the port at which those, who were most exposed to danger, were to meet; ‘he was resolved,’ he said, ‘to be present, and to raise up his hands to God during the battle, like Moses;’* but his prayers, admonitions, and example, were lost upon his contemporaries.”—*Ranke*, vol. i. p. 37.

This change would naturally influence the Popes in their mode of acting. They had previously maintained their power, by exciting, at all times, the activity and energies of men in favour of the most sublime interests of humanity; and had strengthened the influence thus acquired by always leading the movement. When opposed by a powerful enemy with the sword, they were amply protected by their spiritual arms and the faith of the rest of Christians. This faith had now disappeared from amongst sovereigns and nations; and if the Popes henceforth were unwilling to become subject to every prince, who, by force of arms, could advance to Rome, they had to defend themselves by their own armies, and to maintain a force strong enough to withstand at least their ordinary opponents. On this point, let us hear M. Ranke:—

“Whatever may be said of the Popes in former times, it must be allowed they had in view some elevated and noble object, either to raise

* The passage alluded to by our author, occurs in the discourse entitled: “*Oratio ad Sacrum Senatum de profectione contra Turcos.*” “Nec nos pugnaturi pergitur corpore debiles et sacerdotio fungentes, cujus non est proprium versare ferrum. Moysem illum sanctum patrem imitabimur, qui pugnante adversus Amalecitas Israele, orabat in monte. Stabimus in altâ puppe, aut in aliquo montis supercilio, habentesque ante oculos divinam Eucharistiam, id est, Dominum nostrum Jesum Christum, ab eo salutem et victoriam pugnantis nostris militibus implorabimus. Cor contritum et humiliatum non despiciet Deus noster.”—Pii II. P. M. Orationes ed. Mansi ii. p. 178.

an oppressed religion, to destroy paganism, to spread Christianity amongst the nations of the north, or to found a powerful and independent hierarchy. These objects had passed away with time. 'I was once of opinion,' said an orator at the Council of Basle, 'that it would be good to separate the spiritual wholly from the temporal power. But I have learned now, that virtue would be ridiculous without the aid of power, and that the Pope, without the patrimony of the Church, would be nothing more than the slave of kings and princes.'—Vol. i. p. 43.

There were two ways in which the Popes sought to obtain this power; by establishing, for the protection of their relatives, as their natural friends, an independent state, or by subjecting powerful provinces to the immediate dominion of the Church. The first plan was chiefly followed by Sixtus IV and Alexander VI; and although we are far from defending all their measures, and cannot but blame in general the use of their spiritual power for temporal ends; still, we must observe, once for all, that this conduct was quite in accordance with Italian notions at that period; and the wisest man of that age, as he was considered by his contemporaries, Lorenzo de' Medici, in a letter published by Fabroni, severely blames Pope Innocent VIII, for not having done any thing for his family during the five years that he had reigned.* Julius II, on the contrary, established a state entirely dependent on the Church. After he had subdued Cæsar Borgia, and gained by conquest, Perugia, Bologna, Parma, Placentia, &c., he left to the sway of his successors all the beautiful country, from Placentia to Terracina, for their temporal dominion, "so that the kings of France," says Machiavelli, "now respect the authority of the Pope, which formerly every petty baron was accustomed to despise."

This change in the temporal possessions of the Popes was accompanied by that other celebrated change in the minds of men, which is commonly termed the revival of learning. Until the end of the fourteenth century, Italian literature was principally founded on the manners and customs of life in the Italian States. Boccaccio presented, under the form of the novel, pictures copied from every-day life; Petrarca immortalized the sufferings of his own heart, or of his country; and Dante comprised the whole life and spirit of his age, which, clothed in his lofty and sublime conceptions, seem to have undergone a real transfiguration. The matter and style of all these works is entirely *Italian*: but, from the beginning of the fifteenth century, the classic authors of antiquity become the only models. The difference, which arose in this manner, is immense. Dante, for instance, had more than an ordinary acquaintance with the classics, but still he is

* Ranke i. p. 44.

everywhere an Italian and a Christian ; while the greater part of the writers of the fifteenth century endeavour, on the contrary, to appropriate to themselves the thoughts and language of antiquity. A complete incredulity, or, at least, an indifference about all holy things, was the result amongst many men of learning in Italy. In Germany, on the other hand, the study of the ancient languages produced a strong desire of penetrating far into the depths of theology, and of making a particular study of the Bible. Hence arose a spiritual opposition to the Pope, which was soon followed by the Reformation of Luther. Leo X at this period filled the Papal chair (1513-1521).

“ He was full of kindness and condescension. Though it was impossible for him to grant every request, he seldom refused a favour ; and then his refusal was expressed in the most gentle terms. ‘ The Pope is an excellent man,’ said the Venetian ambassador, a close observer, ‘ very liberal, and of a good disposition and kind heart ; and if his relatives did not force him into them, he would avoid every trouble and misunderstanding.’ Another ambassador says of him, ‘ he is a learned lover of the learned, and very religious ; but, at the same time, he enjoys life.’ ”—*Ranke*, i. p. 70.

This last expression explains the interest which Leo took in all the events and changes of his time.

This period is frequently designated “ the age of Leo X ;” and if this distinction is not due to his own merit, it must be allowed that he possessed sufficient susceptibility to stir up in others, and to feel in himself, a love for all that was most beautiful in its discoveries. “ Perhaps,” says M. Ranke, “ this may be considered a kind of intellectual luxury ; but then, it is the only luxury that gives dignity to the man who enjoys it.”

During his reign, the position began to be developed which the succeeding Popes sought to occupy in the political system of Europe. The power of a secondary state consists in keeping itself in such equilibrium between the more powerful states, as to produce a decision in favour of one side or the other by its participation. This was the policy of the secondary Italian states at the time of which we write. The leading powers were France, Germany, and Spain ; the two latter were united by Charles V. By the battle of Marignano, Francis I had determined the superiority in favour of France, and Leo X had been obliged to give way ; but after his alliance with Charles, the Pope had the gratification of seeing the French driven out of Milan, and of obtaining, at the moment of his death, every advantage that he could desire. To Leo succeeded Adrian VI, a native of Utrecht, who had formerly been preceptor to Charles V.

“ For a long time, a more deserving man had not been chosen.

Adrian bore an unsullied character ; he was trust-worthy, pious, active, and grave ; he was never seen to laugh, but a placid smile played upon his features ; still, he was full of pure and benevolent designs : in a word, he was a true ecclesiastic. What a contrast, when he took possession of the same palaces, where Leo X had held his profuse and magnificent court ! We have a letter written by him at that time, wherein he says that he would rather serve God in his cabinet at Louvain, than sit on the Papal throne. In the Vatican, he continued to live like a simple professor. One circumstance may be cited to illustrate his character. He retained the same old female servant, who continued to perform the household duties for him. In every thing else, his manner of living was the same. He rose early, said mass, and then spent his time according to a settled plan, in business or in study, which he interrupted to dine on the most simple fare. He cannot be charged with an aversion for the improvements of his time ; he admired the style of art followed in the Low Countries, and loved to see science adorned with a suitable degree of elegance. Erasmus confesses that he was protected by him from the fanatical attacks of the scholastic divines. Only, the almost heathen tendency of opinion at Rome was censured by him, and he had no desire to hear any thing of the sect of poets."—*Ranke*, i. p. 91-93.

The chief aim that he had in view was to conclude a peace between the Emperor and the King of France, and to unite these two powers against the Turks, who had lately conquered the Island of Rhodes. Besides this, he wished to reform the abuses of the Church, and of the court in particular, which were a subject of complaint even amongst many of the most zealous Catholics. Unfortunately the shortness of his reign (from January to September 1523) did not allow him to put many of his plans in execution ; and as he did not properly understand the Italian character and the former state of the Roman Court, there was nothing but disaffection in those about him.

The successor of Adrian was another of the family of the Medici,—Julius, son of Julian of Medici, who took the name of Clement VII. (1523-1534.) Under his predecessors, he had distinguished himself in the management of the most important affairs ; and his excellent qualities were also displayed during his pontificate.

“ With the greatest care he kept aloof from the different mistakes into which his predecessors had fallen, and avoided the unsteadiness of purpose, profusion, and all that had been blamed in Leo X, not less than the opposition in which Adrian VI had placed himself with his court. All his conduct was regulated with the utmost prudence ; and his character was marked by uprightness and moderation ; he carefully performed the pontifical functions, and gave audiences from morning till evening with unwearied regularity ; and favoured the arts and sciences in the turn which they had taken before his reign. Clement himself was a man of learning and information. He conversed on all subjects with equal

facility, whether connected with theology or philosophy, mechanics or hydraulics. His sagacity on every occasion was more than ordinary; he penetrated into the most intricate affairs, and it was impossible to find a person that could unravel any matter with greater address."—i. p. 98.

A pontiff, possessed of such qualities, would, in less critical circumstances, have discharged the duties of his elevated station with glory to himself and advantage to the Church; but the awkward situation in which he was placed by political events, became too powerful for him. In the beginning of his reign, Clement exerted all his energies in favour of the Emperor and the Spaniards; but afterwards, when the French had been expelled from Italy, and the Spaniards began to act in a manner not less tyrannical than their late enemies, a universal spirit of nationality sprang up in the Italians, and they instantly resolved to drive from their country these haughty strangers, whom they detested and despised as semi-barbarians. To effect this would require all their efforts; and if they failed, they knew they were undone for ever. The Pope placed himself at the head of this movement, in which he was joined by the Venetians, Florentines, and the Duke of Milan.

" ' At this conjuncture,' said the Papal minister Giberto, ' we have not to talk of a petty revenge, of a point of honour, or of a single city; this war is to decide on the freedom or slavery of Italy for ever.' Their success was not equal to their hopes; and the war against the Spaniards was the boldest and most aspiring, but, at the same time, the most unfortunate and dangerous plan that the Pope ever formed."—i. p. 102-104.

To secure his power in Germany, the Emperor's brother entered into a treaty with the Protestants at the very moment when the Pope's troops were entering Lombardy: in the decision of the Diet of Spire (1526), the Pope was not even mentioned, and each one was allowed to act with regard to religion in the way best pleasing to God and to the Emperor; or, in other words, the Protestant principle was openly proclaimed. In Italy itself there was no unity amongst the allies; and to this day it is doubtful whether their general, the Duke of Urbino, was more a coward or a traitor. The whole weight of these evils fell upon the Pope. The taking of Rome by the imperial troops, on the 6th of May, 1527 (usually called the *sacco di Roma*), destroyed all the splendour for which it had been admired since the middle of the preceding century. At last, when the Pope began to despair of a successful turn in his affairs, and when his family had been banished from Florence, he came to a treaty with the Emperor, but it did not lead to a sincere reconciliation. The settlement of religious differences, and the disputes about summoning a council, which the Pope had no desire to assemble in

these circumstances, inclined him to unite with France, an alliance which unfortunately secured to the Protestants too much favour with the Emperor. The last years of his reign were also embittered by the apostacy of Henry VIII, still greater troubles threatened Italy, and Clement died of chagrin and sorrow.

He was succeeded by Alexander Farnese, who took the name of Paul III, (1534-1549.) The new Pope had been educated in the worldly notions and manners of the age of the Medici; partly at Rome under Pomponius Lætus, and partly at Florence, in the gardens of Lorenzi de' Medici. He loved and cherished the fine arts, and, before he entered the ecclesiastical state, his conduct was not free from irregularities. During the forty years that he was cardinal, he distinguished himself by his activity and address. During his pontificate, he had three great objects in view, to promote an alliance between the Emperor and the King of France, in order to induce them afterwards to undertake an expedition against the Turks; to reform abuses in the Church, without lessening the authority of the Holy See; and lastly, to augment the temporal power of the ecclesiastical state and of his own family. Although he did not succeed in all his designs, still his pontificate is one of the most remarkable reigns throughout this history. He succeeded from time to time in interrupting the war, by making peace between Charles V and Francis I,—he brought about the opening of the Council of Trent,—and the Farnese family was raised to the rank of independent princes. The close of his life was not equally fortunate; he was hardly able to effect a reconciliation with the Emperor; the council was transferred and suspended, and his grand-children rebelled against him. The grief occasioned by this revolt hastened his death.

Julius III, of the family of Del Monte, who succeeded (1550-1555), sought to avoid any misunderstanding with the Emperor. He immediately reopened the Council of Trent, and exerted all his influence to restore peace to Italy. But the hatred of the French King, Henry II, towards the Emperor, and his alliance with the Protestants in Germany, and with the Farnese family in Italy, were a death-blow to his hopes. The Council dispersed and fled at the approach of the army of Maurice of Saxony, and even in Italy the Emperor and the Pope were obliged to yield to France. From this time, the Pope laid aside all political concerns, and gave himself up entirely to ecclesiastical interests, amidst which his only relaxation was to attend to the construction of that delightful villa, situated out of the *Porta del Popolo* at Rome, and called to this day the Villa of Pope Julius.

After the short interregnum of Marcellus II, (1555) of whom

his contemporaries say that the world was not worthy to possess him, Paul IV, of the family of Caraffa, ascended the Papal throne,—a man who, at the age of seventy-nine, retained all the vigour and fire of youth (1555-1559).

“ His figure was of commanding height, but slender ; his step was quick, and his body seemed all sinew. As he followed no fixed system of life, sleeping often during the day, and transacting business at night, —woe to the servant who entered his room without being called,—he always acted from the impulse of the moment. But these impulses were governed in him by a conviction entertained throughout the progress of a life of more than ordinary length, and settled down into a second nature. He seemed to know no other duty, and to think of no other occupation, but to restore the ancient Catholic faith, with the influence that it had possessed in former ages. What might not be expected from Paul IV, when raised to the highest dignity, who had never yielded to worldly respect, and whose opinions had always been marked by extreme severity ? As he had never done any favours to the cardinals, and as he had ever displayed the utmost rigour, he himself was astonished at his election. He was convinced that he had been chosen, not by the cardinals, but by Almighty God, to execute this design. ‘ We promise and swear,’ said the new Pope, in the bull by which he took possession of his dignity, ‘ truly and sincerely to take every care that the reformation of the Church and of the Roman court shall be accomplished.’ He rendered the day of his accession famous by publishing edicts respecting convents and religious orders.”—i. p. 280-281.

Besides this ecclesiastical zeal, the Pope had no other passion except his hatred against the Emperor Charles V. The Emperor he hated, as a Neapolitan, as an Italian, as a Catholic, and as Pope. He was persuaded that the Emperor, who had frequently offended him, secretly favoured the Protestants. Moreover, he could not forget Italy in his younger days, when she was free and independent, and he loved to liken her to a musical instrument with four strings, which represented Venice, Milan, the Ecclesiastical States, and Naples. The Caraffa family had always been attached to the French cause, and had borne arms against the people of Castile and Catalonia. The Emperor had already been several times discomfited in Germany, Italy, and the Low Countries ; and the time when he was suffering most from these misfortunes, seemed to the Pope the most favourable moment for putting his plans in execution.

“ He said the time was come when Charles and his son were to receive the punishment due to their sins, and the deliverance of Italy would soon be accomplished. If the world would not hear or would not assist him, let it at least say but once that it was an old Italian on the brink of the grave, who ought rather to seek repose and prepare for death, who had formed such noble designs and conceived such lofty ideas.”—i. p. 285.

But the war was unsuccessful, notwithstanding his alliance with France; and the Duke of Alba, the Spanish general, concluded a peace at the gates of Rome.

The Pope spent the rest of his life in working out his plans of reformation, in which his own family was not spared. "He had promoted his brother's sons to the highest honours, not from selfishness or affection for his own family; but, as his nephews entertained his own hatred of the Spaniards, he considered them his natural supporters in the war." (i. p. 297.) When he discovered their incapacity, he deprived them of their offices, and sent all his relatives into banishment. He used every effort to reform abuses, and to preserve the purity of faith with all possible severity,—a severity which underwent no change, even when it had produced disastrous results, as in the affairs of England, and the transactions with the new Emperor Ferdinand I.

The succeeding Pope, Pius IV, of the Milanese branch of the Medici (1559-1565), was of a different disposition. He was all kindness and condescension. "He might be seen daily in the public places on horseback or on foot, with scarcely any attendants. He was affable to all." (i. p. 317.) The same difference was visible in political concerns.

"Paul IV was persuaded that it was the duty of the Pope to subject emperors and kings to his authority, and this conviction made him engage in so many wars and contests. Pius saw this error the more clearly from having been himself in opposition to the Pope who had fallen into it. 'It is thus,' said he, 'that we have lost England, which might have been saved if we had given more aid and support to Cardinal Pole; in the same manner we have lost Scotland; and during the war, the new opinions have penetrated into France.' Pius, on the contrary, wished to preserve peace above every thing, and did not even desire that a war should be undertaken against the Protestants."—i. p. 323.

The Pope frequently repeated, in familiar conversations with the Venetian ambassador, that he trusted he should be able to employ his forces for the advantage of the Church, and he hoped, with the assistance of God, to bring about much good. In fact, he reopened the Council of Trent, and succeeded in bringing it to a conclusion, an event which has rendered his pontificate one of the most glorious in the Church.

Pius IV was advanced in years, and could not have undergone so much labour, if he had not been supported by his nephew the great St. Charles Borromeo. The Pope, who had caused some of the relatives of his predecessor to be executed for their crimes, saw the danger of favouring his nephew in an immoderate degree; and, fortunately, St. Charles never sought any personal advancement.

“ Charles Borromeo did not consider that his relationship with the Pope, or his position in the government of the Church, allowed him any privilege or indulgence; on the contrary, he held them as a motive of duty that called for every sacrifice at his hands. In the management of affairs, his modesty was not less remarkable than his assiduity; he gave audiences with unremitting attention, and dedicated all his time to the administration of state affairs. After his death, his name was inserted in the Calendar of the Saints; but even while at the head of affairs, he was noble-minded and of irreproachable life. The Venetian ambassador, Jerome Soranzo, speaks of him in the following terms. ‘ As far as can be known by man, he is free from every defect; he lives in so religious a manner, and gives such good example, that even the most perfect find nothing wanting in him.’ His only recreation was to assemble the learned about him in the evening. The conversation began with topics of profane literature; but from Epictetus and the Stoics, whom Borromeo in his youth did not disregard, the company soon passed to ecclesiastical subjects.”—*Ranke*, i. p. 321.

The highly religious turn which we have observed in the reigns of Paul IV and Pius IV, reached its height under Pius V, of the Ghisleri family (1566-1572). This Pope had entered into a monastery at the age of fourteen, and was distinguished by his piety and zeal in the performance of his ecclesiastical functions. When raised to the Papal dignity, he persevered in the same line of conduct.

“ As Pope, he followed the same rigorous kind of life that had been prescribed by his former monastic rule; he observed the fasts without any relaxation; he said mass often, and heard it every day, and took care not to allow his religious exercises to interfere with public affairs; did not repose after dinner, and rose early. To prove that these severities with himself were grounded on strong and sincere motives, we may remark, that he did not consider the possession of the highest dignity in the Church at all favourable to piety, or of any service towards saving his soul, or gaining the rewards of Paradise; and he thought that, without prayer, the burden of it would be wholly insupportable. The grace of fervent prayer, the only thing in which he took delight, was vouchsafed to him till the hour of his death; during his devotions he was frequently moved to tears, and he rose then from them with the conviction that God had listened to his request. Pius V knew that he had always walked in the right road, and that by it he had been led to the Papacy. This knowledge gave him a confidence that raised him above all worldly considerations.”—i. p. 355.

The Pope endeavoured everywhere to introduce his own severe notions, and began with Rome itself.

“ The reformation of the court, which had been so often talked of, was now effected, but not in the way formerly proposed. The expenses of the household were considerably reduced; Pius V needed but little, and he was accustomed to say that a man who wished to govern, should begin

with himself. He imitated his predecessors in reforming abuses ; he allowed few dispensations, and still fewer compositions ; he retrenched many indulgences granted by the Popes before him."—i. p. 358.

He treated with great severity all non-resident bishops and curates,—restored the ancient discipline in the convents,—and placed them in part under the inspection of the bishops. Severe and impartial justice marked every act of his temporal administration. On the last Wednesday in each month, a court was held by him and his cardinals, to which every one might bring his appeals from the ordinary tribunals. His disregard of human respect, and his irreproachable conduct, gained him the obedience of the Catholic sovereigns. Still, his reign did not pass without some misunderstandings and differences. Wherever the new doctrines appeared, they were cut off in the bud by the Inquisition. The Pope succeeded at last in inducing the Italian States and the King of Spain to join in an expedition against the Turks, which was gloriously ended by the victory of Lepanto.

“ When Pius V felt the approach of death, he visited once more the seven churches of Rome, to take leave, as he said, of the holy places ; he thrice kissed the lowest steps of the holy stairs. He had promised on one occasion that he would employ not only the property of the Church, even the crosses and chalices, but also to join in person in an expedition against England. During his visit to the churches, he met some English Catholics who had been exiled from their country, to whom he declared he would gladly shed his blood for their sake.”—i. p. 373.

During the reigns of Pius IV and Pius V, Catholicism acquired fresh strength, and reached the position which it has since held with regard to Protestantism. Clement VII had been too much embarrassed with political difficulties to be able to effect a reformation of the abuses that had crept into the Church. The first act of Paul III, was to give the cardinal's hat to several persons of eminence, without considering any qualification but their merit. “ They were men of unblameable morals, bore a character for piety and profound learning, and were well acquainted with the wants of different countries.” Pole was one of them. “ The Pope granted them liberty of speech, in a greater degree than was customary ; he could endure opposition from them in Consistory, and he himself introduced free discussion.” (vol. i. p. 145, 239.) These cardinals composed a congregation to reform abuses,—an undertaking in which they displayed great activity. Attempts were made at the same time to produce a reconciliation between the Catholics and Protestants in Germany. But in spite of many conferences, resumed as often as interrupted,—and although, by the exertions of the nuncio Contarini, both sides had come to an agreement on several

important points, at the diet of Ratisbon in 1541,—the separation between the members of the two creeds, daily became wider.

Meanwhile, Protestantism had extended over a larger space of country; but Catholicism gained in the increased intensity of its powers, whatever it might lose in extent of territory. We must here mention three institutions, which powerfully contributed to this increase of strength; the new religious orders, the Inquisition, and the Council of Trent.

At all periods of greater anxiety to the Church, new religious orders, adapted to her actual wants, have sprung up. Hence the rise of the order of St. Benedict, in the sixth century, and of those of St. Francis and St. Dominic in the thirteenth. Already, under Clement VII (1522,) the Camaldolese had been reformed by Paul Giustiniani; and the reformed Franciscans, generally called the Capuchins, had endeavoured to restore the rigorous discipline, for which their order was distinguished during the life-time of their founder. The order of the Theatines, in the foundation of which, Paul IV, while cardinal, had taken a very active part, was intended to be of service in reforming the secular clergy. We need not mention other religious orders, such as the Barnabites, whose only objects were to relieve and assist the sick or the miserable, by care, alms, or religious instruction. But all these orders were soon surpassed in importance and influence by the Society of Jesus, whose rule was expressly suited to the peculiar necessities of the times. M. Ranke speaks of it in the following terms:—

“ This also was an association of regular priests, the basis of which was a union of the duties of both monks and priests, but it was very different from all bodies formed on a like plan. The Theatines had already laid aside several of the obligations prescribed to the monastic orders; the Jesuits went still farther. They were not content with not wearing the monastic habit; they discontinued the usual public exercises of devotion, and the duty of singing in choir, which took up the larger portion of the time in other religious communities. Thus, freed from these less necessary occupations, they dedicated all their time and all their talents to the essential duties of preaching, confession, and the instruction of youth.”—vol. i. p. 193,

The secret of their power and influence lay in their obedience and entire devotedness to the objects of the society. The schools of the Jesuits soon surpassed all others; they adopted a systematic plan of instruction, and we owe to them the division of the scholars into different classes. They paid the same attention to the morals of their pupils, and gave instruction as well as spiritual assistance gratuitously, without asking for recompense or alms. Their success was wonderful, and, in a few years, colleges under

their direction were built in Italy, Spain, and Portugal, and even in the colonies beyond the Atlantic.

The Roman Inquisition was established when the germs of heterodox opinions about the fundamental doctrines of the Catholic religion began to appear in different parts of Italy. The cardinals of Toledo and Caraffa advised Paul III to establish the Inquisition at Rome, in imitation of the one already existing in Spain, as a supreme tribunal in matters of faith, to which all similar institutions in other countries should be subordinate. This plan was carried into execution in 1542. The Inquisition was, of course, more severe in the States of the Church, where it could be supported by the secular power; still its power was felt in a considerable degree in other parts of Italy and in Spain. The principles laid down for the guidance of this tribunal by Cardinal Caraffa (afterwards Paul IV) were, "That in matters of religious faith no concessions must be allowed to the circumstances of the time; that on the slightest suspicion, the greatest activity must be resorted to; that there must be no distinction out of respect to princes or prelates, however elevated their position, but, on the contrary, the Inquisition should proceed with greater rigour against those who should attempt to screen themselves under the protection of any powerful patron, and only he who had confessed his fault, should be treated with lenity and paternal love; finally, the tribunal must not tolerate Protestants, and especially Calvinists." (i. p. 207.) The Inquisition guarded most carefully against dangerous books, and ordered all those to be destroyed which contained heretical doctrines.

But the most important organ for augmenting and concentrating the power of the Church was the Council of Trent, by which all the doctrines contested by the Protestants were so clearly defined, that no farther disputes could arise amongst Catholics about the meaning of them. The canons of the council formed a rallying point for the Catholics of all countries. The excellent measures for correcting abuses, proposed by it were no less salutary. Pius IV and Pius V, caused the canons to be adopted in all the Catholic kingdoms, and procured the execution of several decrees, such as the publication of the *Roman Catechism* and the *Vulgate*, which the council had recommended to the care of the Pope.

Under the same Popes, the temporal power took a position different from that in which we have hitherto observed it. The superiority of the Spaniards in Italy was so well established, that all rivalry with them would have been useless. The influence of the Ecclesiastical State, as a political power, was at an

end; but it now became an auxiliary to the spiritual power of the Popes, especially by means of the immense sums of money that they drew from it. The financial system, followed by the Popes, had considerable influence, not only on the political concerns of that period, but likewise on the political economy of all Europe.

In the Middle Ages, the system of banks and letters of exchange chiefly owed its origin to the circumstance, that in every part of Europe, there were ecclesiastical revenues to be sent to Rome. In like manner, the system of national debts was first introduced by the Popes. The chief means of raising money, at first, was, at Rome as in France, to create new offices, to sell them afterwards. The purchasers had to receive the interest of their capital out of the fees of the Roman Courts. The duties attached to their office were trifling. This method of procuring supplies was soon found inadequate, because, just at the beginning of the sixteenth century, the ecclesiastical revenues were considerably diminished by the encroachments of princes and by the rise of Protestantism. The plan was then resorted to of establishing officers, whose salaries should be chargeable on the revenues of the ecclesiastical state which had lately been formed. By law, these posts did not descend to the heirs of the first occupier, at whose death the government would gain the purchase money paid by him. On this account, these loans were termed "*monti vacabili*." Clement VII was the first Pope who made a loan to the amount of two hundred thousand ducats at ten per cent. interest, which descended to the heirs of the original proprietor. To pay this interest, the revenues of the customs were made over to the holders of the loan, who had a certain share in the administration of them. But the first direct contribution was demanded by Paul III, under the name of a "subsidy," which, originally, was fixed for only three years, but was always renewed at the expiration of each term. Succeeding Popes were obliged to make other direct loans, and to raise new imposts to pay the interest of them. By these means, the Popes were better provided than any other sovereigns in Europe with money, with which they aided all the undertakings set on foot by the Catholics.

"What then were the wants that compelled the Popes to adopt a way of making loans—so singular and so expensive to their own territories? They were chiefly the wants of Catholicism in general. The assistance given to the Catholic powers in their wars against the Protestants, and in their enterprises against the Turks, were, henceforth, nearly always the principal cause that obliged the Popes to have recourse to new financial measures. The loan (*monte*) of Pius V, is called "*monte*

Lega," because the capital of it was employed to carry on the war against the Turks, which the Pope undertook in *league* with Spain and the republic of Venice. Every movement throughout Europe had an influence, in the same way, on the States of the Church, which, by some new impost, had to contribute to the defence of the interests of the Church. For this reason, it was of the highest consequence to the spiritual power of the Popes that they should possess an independent state."—i. p. 414.

From this digression, let us return to the succession of the Popes. To Pius V, succeeded Gregory XIII, of the Buoncampagno family, (1572-1585), who was not unworthy of his predecessors. Like Pius V, he was careful not to show any extraordinary favour to his relatives. On one occasion, when a cardinal, who had been just raised to the purple, told him that he should always be grateful to the relatives and nephews of his holiness, the Pope exclaimed impatiently, "you should be grateful to God and the Holy See." He fulfilled no less exactly the other duties of his station.

"His conduct was not only irreproachable, but edifying. Never did any Pope perform certain duties more carefully than Gregory. He had lists of persons in every country, who were fit for the Episcopal dignity: and, on every proposition that was made to him, he appeared to be well-informed."—i. p. 422.

Above all things, he was attentive to the instruction of youth, and was particularly favourable to the Society of Jesus. He founded for them, colleges at Rome and in other countries. He established colleges in that capital for the English, German, and other nations, which produced many zealous defenders of the Church. Amongst his reformatations, that of the Calendar is the most celebrated. He, likewise, aided the Catholics in all their wars against the Turks and the Protestants with considerable subsidies.

The sums expended in the education of youth, amounted to two millions of crowns during his pontificate. To cover this enormous expenditure, he endeavoured to augment his revenues by reclaiming the ancient rights and possessions of the Holy See. These attempts were successful at first, but they soon became a source of many disorders. Old family feuds were rekindled, troops of brigands destroyed the public security, and were countenanced by the neighbouring states, whom the Pope had exasperated by claiming the former rights of the Church.

In the midst of these troubles, Gregory XIII died, and was succeeded by Sixtus V, of the Peretti family, (1585-1590.) He was the son of a peasant, and although elevated to the Papal throne at such a critical period, he possessed talents equal to the arduous task of putting an end to all disorders.

We regret that we have not room for the whole of M. Ranke's account of the life of Sixtus V before his election; we may, however, remark, that he has proved from authentic documents, that the story so often told about the manner in which Sixtus V gained his election by feigning a weak state of health, is wholly destitute of foundation, and, on the contrary, that the cardinals chose him because he was full of strength and vigour,—qualities that were indispensable in the existing posture of affairs. The Pope saw in his election a special call from God, and took for his motto; "From my birth, thou, O God, hast been my protector." He was persuaded, that in all his undertakings, he had the particular favour of Providence. When he mounted the throne, he declared his firm determination to extirpate all brigands and violators of the laws. If he had not sufficient power to effect this, God, he said, would assuredly send legions of angels to assist him.—(i. p. 445.)

He, in fact, succeeded. By well-planned measures, and by the unrelenting execution of justice, he exterminated the banditti in the first year of his reign. He conciliated other sovereigns by yielding to them on trivial and unimportant points; he composed the differences between the barons, and sought to increase, by every means in his power, the internal wealth of his dominions. He undertook to drain the Chiana near Orvieto and the Pontine marshes, and encouraged manufactures of silk and wool, by edicts and advances of money. He established congregations to regulate and administer to the various wants of the Church and State, and his administration has been the model on which his successors have proceeded. The same remark is applicable to his conduct towards his relatives. The successors of Paul IV, had shown little favour to the members of their own families; and Pius V had made a severe law, by which no Pope could alienate a province of the Church to form an independent state for his family. Sixtus V raised one of his nephews to the dignity of cardinal, and the other to that of marquis, giving him, at the same time, a suitable estate. Most of the Popes down to Pius VII, followed his example.

Amongst his contemporaries, he was most celebrated for his administration of the finances. At his accession, the treasury was empty, and, within three years, he amassed four millions and a half of crowns of silver, which he deposited in the Castle of St. Angelo, to be used only in particular emergencies, such as for a crusade to recover the Holy Land;—a general war against the Turks;—in times of famine or pestilence;—to repel an invasion of the States of the Church;—to recover a city belonging to the Holy See;—or when any Catholic province might be in danger

of falling into the hands of an enemy. (i. p. 462.) It is to be lamented, that this sum, so considerable in those days, had been collected on the same financial system formerly pursued, by creating new offices and raising fresh taxes to pay the interest of loans. The Pope was as sparing as possible, confining the expenses of his own table to six paoli, about half-a-crown a-day.

The city of Rome owes its present appearance and form to Sixtus V. It was only by the construction of the new aqueduct, of Acqua Felice, that the Pincian, Quirinal, and Esquiline hills were rendered habitable. He raised several obelisks, and there is scarcely any part of the city which he did not adorn with vast and noble edifices. The cupola of St. Peter's was completed in twenty-two months.

The Pontificate of Sixtus V was rendered glorious by the victories gained over Protestantism. During the last years of the Council of Trent (1563), Protestantism had been most widely spread. England and the Scandinavian kingdoms had been made wholly Protestant, or, at least, the Catholic religion had lost all its political influence. In Poland and Hungary, the Protestants had possessed themselves of all the principal offices. In Germany, one of the Venetian ambassadors said, that only the tenth part of the kingdom had remained faithful to the Catholic Church; the rest had become Protestants, or had fallen into utter indifference about matters of faith. In France and the Low Countries, the doctrines of Calvin had spread in every direction from their central point at Geneva. Even in 1561, the Venetian ambassador declared, that not a single province of France was free from Protestantism. "Your grace," he said to the Doge, "may be assured that, except the lower classes, who still frequent the churches, all the nation has apostatized, especially the nobles and the young men under forty years of age, almost without exception."

This victorious progress of Protestantism was arrested by the increased activity of the Church, and the renewed zeal of the Catholic sovereigns. The Society of Jesus gathered the most glorious trophies in this contest. Their arrival in a Protestant province, was the signal for the restoration of the Catholic faith. This happened particularly in Germany, the cradle of the Reformation. Vienna, Ingolstadt, and Cologne, were the headquarters of the Jesuits, and the seats of their principal colleges. The sciences were so well cultivated in them, that they soon rivalled Geneva, Wittemberg, and Jena, and their system of elementary instruction was in such repute, that even the Protestants sent their children to them. As the Protestants had been successful by frequent appeals to the people, the Jesuits used the same

plan in behalf of Catholicism, by preaching, catechizing, and founding schools for gratuitously instructing the poor, (ii. p. 25, et seq.) Protestantism was chiefly, in Germany, combated by means of science and instruction; and, on this account, there were fewer outrages committed by either party, than in the Low Countries, and in France. We cannot enter at present into the history of the Reformation of France, of the League, of the death of Henry III, and the accession of Henry IV. It is sufficient to remark, that the Popes, and especially Sixtus V, favoured the League, until Henry IV declared his desire of returning to the bosom of the Catholic Church. Sixtus V was prevented by death from ending this war.

In England alone the Catholic religion had not made much progress. Gregory XIII had reckoned on the multitude of Catholics oppressed by the government of Elizabeth* in England and Ireland, when he assisted with supplies of money Thomas Stukley, an Englishman, who misapplied the money, and joined in the expedition of Don Sebastian of Portugal against Africa; and the Geraldine in Ireland, whose undertaking led to such disastrous results in 1579.

"The English punished this rebellion with the most cruel severities: men and women were driven into barns and there burnt to death; the children were slaughtered, and the whole county of Monmouth was devastated."—ii. p. 87.

On the failure of this attempt, the Pope endeavoured to reconquer England, or, at least, to preserve the faith of the Catholics, who yet remained, by spiritual means; and he assisted Cardinal Allen in establishing a College for the English nation at Doway; another was founded at Rome. Elizabeth enacted the most rigorous laws against the Catholics, and to prevent the growth of their religion, adopted measures which M. Ranke justly terms, "a kind of Protestant inquisition." The persecution of the Catholics, the death of Mary Stuart, and differences with Philip II, were the causes of the Spanish expedition against England. Sixtus V promised the king a million of crowns, as soon as he should have seized one of the English ports. The fate of the Armada is well known. It was the death-blow to the power of the Spaniards. The reigns of the three next successors of Sixtus

* M. Ranke (ii. p. 86, note 1.) publishes the following fragment of a contemporary Italian discourse on the state of Ireland. "The queen's government in that country is declared to be a tyranny, which abandons the management of affairs to English ministers, who, to enrich themselves, employ all the arts of tyranny in that country, such as exporting the products and commodities of it to England, taxing the people against their ancient laws and privileges, and keeping up war and factions amongst the inhabitants,—because the English are unwilling that they should learn the difference between slavery and freedom."

V, Urban VII, Gregory XIV, and Innocent IX, were too short to allow them time to acquire sufficient influence over the affairs of Europe. It was reserved for Clement VIII, of the Aldobrandini family (1592-1605), to put an end to the civil war, by the activity with which he discharged the duties of the pontificate.

“The Pope held sittings in the morning, and gave audiences in the afternoon. He received and examined all informations; and not unfrequently was better instructed about them than the referendaries who brought the matters forward. He laboured with the same application as he had formerly done, while judge of the Rota (the supreme tribunal of justice). In the midst of these affairs, he was never guilty of the slightest neglect in his spiritual duties. He confessed every evening to Cardinal Baronius, and celebrated mass every morning. He fasted every Friday and Saturday. His recreation, after the labours of the week, was to assemble on Sunday, some pious monks, or the fathers of the convent of the Vallicella (the Oratorians), to converse with them on spiritual matters.”—ii. p. 234.

He granted absolution to Henry IV, as soon as he had given sufficient pledges that he would uphold the Catholic religion in France. He then terminated the war between Spain and France, by the peace of Vervins (May 2, 1598). When his nuncio had succeeded in obtaining from the Spaniards the restitution of their conquests in France, and in inducing Henry to break off his alliance with the Low Countries and England, he declared “that the pope, his master, would take more pleasure in the success of this negotiation than in the taking of Ferrara, for a peace that should restore tranquillity to Europe would be more regarded by him than any temporal conquest.”—ii. p. 307.

This was the most glorious action of his reign, and during the rest of his life he succeeded in preserving the balance between these two powers.

Clement VIII was succeeded by Leo XI, who reigned only a few weeks, and then by Paul V, of the Borghese family (1605-1621), who had kept aloof from political affairs, and spent the chief part of his life in the study and practice of the Canon Law. All the ancient rights of the popes were deeply fixed in his mind, and as he had been elected to the popedom without having sought for it, he believed himself destined by Almighty God to re-establish the rights and powers that the popes had lost; and he was accustomed to say “that his conscience obliged him to deliver the Church from the usurpation and violence from which she had suffered, and that he would rather risk his life than have to answer one day before the throne of God for the neglecting of any one of his duties.”—ii. p. 324.

Guided by these principles, Paul V sought to recover from the

several princes of Europe the ancient rights of the Church, that were exercised by them. Spain and Savoy gave way on several points, but his disputes with the republic of Venice caused the famous schism in 1606, which was not ended without some injury to the pontifical authority, although the Venetians had apparently withdrawn their pretensions on some of the matters in question.

Meanwhile, the progress of the Catholic religion in Protestant countries had been on the increase. In Poland, where, in 1573, liberty of conscience had been proclaimed, and where, in 1579, payment of the tithes had been suspended, new troubles had broken out, but the king's troops were victorious over the Protestants, and the political malcontents with whom they were in alliance (1607). From that time, the most important places were held by Catholics, the papal nuncios provided for the election of men of merit to the episcopal dignity, and the duty of preaching to the people, and directing the instruction of youth, was intrusted to the Society of Jesus. Hopes had likewise been entertained that the Catholic religion would be introduced into Sweden by its lawful king Siegmond, at that time king of Poland; but Protestantism had become too deeply rooted, and the king was not sufficiently powerful to snatch the reins of government from his Protestant uncle. Even in Russia, which the Popes had in vain so often endeavoured to convert to Catholicity, there were favourable prospects, which were soon dissipated when the pseudo-Demetrius was dethroned. In Germany the gradual restoration of the Catholic faith, already mentioned, had continued; particularly in the ecclesiastical states, the proprietors of which had exercised, to a great extent, their seignorial rights, in compelling their dependents to adopt the religion of their choice. The alliance of the Protestant princes, known by the name of the "Union" was formed to oppose the encroachments of Catholicism, but it was more than counterbalanced by the "League" of the Catholic princes, under the auspices of the Duke of Bavaria. In France, the Protestants had little political influence; the temporal power was no longer employed against them, but the Catholic Church was most active in bringing her internal resources into the field. It was the age of Berulle, of St. Francis of Sales, of St. Vincent of Paul, and their illustrious followers; the order of the Ursulines was founded to assist in the instruction of youth of the other sex; the nuns of the order of St. Francis of Sales gave themselves up to the care of the sick; the Brothers of Mercy were established for the same heroic purpose; the congregation of St. Maur watched over the instruction of the children of the nobility, and laboured to revive the study of the history and antiquities of the Church.

The progress of Catholicism, which we have described, and

the political differences that were connected with it, led to the last decisive contest between the two creeds,—the famous Thirty Years' War. Throughout the first half of the war, the Catholic cause was everywhere victorious; indeed, this was the epoch during which it possessed more power than it had enjoyed since the time of the Reformation.

Paul V died immediately after he had received the news of the victory at Prague. His successor, Gregory XV, of the Ludovisi family (1621-1623), was advanced in age and declining in health, but his nephew, Cardinal Lewis Ludovisi, who was at the head of affairs, and whom his very enemies acknowledged to be one of the first statesmen of his age, guarded the interests of religion with all the zeal and energy of his powerful mind. In Bohemia, Austria, and Hungary, the Catholic was restored as the only religion of the state; in the Germanic empire, it had acquired additional influence by the transfer of the Electorate of Pfalz to the duke of Bavaria. The activity of the missionaries and bishops in the Low Countries made a daily increase in the number of Catholics. Even in England the cause of religion was not hopeless, as the hereditary prince Charles was on the point of marrying a princess of Spain. At the same time the Catholic religion had been extensively propagated in America, China, and Japan. All these efforts radiated from a common centre at Rome, where the Pope had increased the College of Propaganda on a plan sufficient to comprise all the nations of the world.

Once more, these successes of Catholicism were arrested. After the victories which Tilly and Wallenstein had gained over the king of Denmark, the emperor had no enemy to fear in Germany, and his power was greater than that of Charles V after the battle of Muhlberg. Negotiations were commenced to effect a reconciliation between the two religions. All the ecclesiastical property seized by the Protestants since the peace of Passau was to be restored to the Catholics. France laid aside for a moment her hatred against Spain, and even joined in alliance with her to attack England. Although Buckingham made war against them by assisting the Protestants in France, he could not save the fortress of Rochelle, which was the last support of the Protestant power. Nothing but divisions in the Catholic camp put a stop to these successes.

Cardinal Richelieu, who at that time governed France, had formed a plan for reducing the power of Spain and Austria, with the aid of the Protestants; but the remonstrances of the Pope and the Catholics had obliged him to abandon it (1625). He resumed it after the taking of Rochelle, and a favourable opportunity soon presented itself for putting it into execution. The last

duke of Mantua had died without leaving any direct issue ; and, as his lawful heir, the duke of Nevers was devoted to the interests of France, no doubt was entertained that the emperor and the Spanish court would refuse to admit his claim. He, therefore, took possession of the duchy, without sending any previous notice to the emperor, or the king of Spain, who forthwith declared war against him.

Unhappily, Gregory XV was now dead. He had gained the entire confidence of the Catholics in political no less than spiritual affairs. His successor was Urban VIII, of the Barberini family (1623-1644). He was a man of distinguished talents and ability, and his superiority was allowed by his colleagues in the several ecclesiastical offices which he had filled. On the throne, he departed from the principles that had guided his predecessors, who, on their accession, had generally laid aside their private views, and devoted their whole attention to the propagation and preservation of Catholicism, and had made political negotiations subservient to these primary interests. Urban VIII, on the contrary, who entertained a high opinion of his own talents, and was young and vigorous at the period of his elevation, was led away by his personal inclinations. He retained his former antipathy to the Spaniards, and his predilection for the French. Moreover, as Urban was anxious to increase the temporal power of the States of the Church, and to destroy the power of the Spaniards in Italy, he was induced to favour the designs of Richelieu.

The Emperor's successes did not immediately cease. The restitution of ecclesiastical property was enforced with greater exactness,—an army had entered the Low Countries to assist the Spaniards,—another had forced a passage into Italy through the defiles of Switzerland. Richelieu could not but observe that France, by herself, was not powerful enough to oppose a barrier to the Emperor ; and as England was distracted by internal divisions, he endeavoured to form an alliance with the King of Sweden, Gustavus Adolphus, who, in spite of several defeats, had continued the war single-handed against the King of Poland. The Cardinal negotiated an armistice between Sweden and Poland, and afterwards concluded, in the summer of 1630, an alliance with the former, by which the King of France obliged himself to pay subsidies to the King, who, on his part, was to bring troops into the field against the emperor. Even in Germany, the French were aided by the opposition which the Catholic princes maintained against the power of the emperor, who was obliged to give way before it in the Diet of Ratisbon. Ferdinand II destroyed his formidable army by withdrawing the

command from Wallenstein, the most skilful of his generals, and restored all his conquests in Italy.

Gustavus Adolphus pushed his victories into the centre of Germany, and the latter part of the 'Thirty Years' War is chiefly remarkable for the defeats suffered by the Catholics. After the year 1630, the influence of religion and the Church almost wholly disappeared, and political interests alone prevailed in the great events of Europe. By this change, the Popes lost their influence over the policy of Europe.

We here close our analysis; for, although M. Ranke has brought down his history to Pius VII, this latter part of his work is a mere outline, from which an extract could hardly be made. We trust, however, that we shall have another opportunity of recurring to several important passages in it, such as the history of Jansenism,—the administration of the ecclesiastical state, and the history of the Society of Jesus.

Having completed the first part of our task, it is now our duty to make a few observations on the spirit in which the work before us has been written, and the manner in which facts contained in it have been recorded by the author.

The principles by which he has been guided are expressly laid down by M. Ranke in his Preface (p. xv.) He excludes all prejudice or predilection as to the Holy See, and views the history of the Popes not with the eyes of a theologian or a canonist, but only as a portion of universal history, in which he principally directs his attention to the influence of the Popes over the states of Europe, and the reaction of the exercise of it upon themselves. We meet, therefore, with no such invectives against the Popes as Protestant theologians amongst his countrymen are daily publishing; still less does he raise a cry of "No Popery;" because, he avows an opinion that the danger that called forth that cry is no longer formidable. He considers the history of the Popes in a purely *political* point of view, which he terms *more purely historical* than that hitherto taken by Catholic or Protestant writers. But, if we reflect that history should never lose sight of its leading object, we can scarcely concur in the opinion here expressed. It is true that the really spiritual element in the Church stands isolated from any political connexion or dependence. Their relation to each other is like that which subsists between the soul and the body; the historian, therefore, of the Church, who confines his attention to political events, passes over an essential part of his duty, and his method is not less prejudicial to history, than the rules of hermeneutical interpretation followed by the rationalists have been to the Bible. How, for instance, can the reader form a just notion of the conduct of the Popes since the Refor-

mation, when that event is never mentioned save where it appears in connexion with state policy; and its author, Luther, is spoken of only once or twice, as if by accident. (i. pp. 77, 183.) We do not for a moment deny that the Popes, during the first part of the sixteenth century, allowed themselves to be swayed in too great a degree by political considerations; but we must, at the same time, bear in mind the necessity, which has been more clearly established by M. Ranke than by any preceding historian, of some temporal power being possessed by the Popes to insure the freer exercise of their spiritual power. Even in this case, therefore, the policy of the Popes was not solely directed by temporal views. Farther, would this necessity itself warrant us in referring all the actions of the Popes, even those that are of themselves wholly ecclesiastical, to temporal motives? And, how could such an attribution of motives be reconciled with the fact, that these very Popes employed, in ecclesiastical affairs of the greatest consequence, the cardinals who were most distinguished for learning and piety, and on whom M. Ranke bestows such exalted and such well-deserved encomiums? (i. pp. 145, 500.) Such was the case especially in the pontificate of Paul III; in treating of which, the political ideas of the author have betrayed him into a completely erroneous account of the most remarkable events.

He supposes, for instance, the delays of the Council of Trent to have been caused by a series of political machinations, contrived by the Pope, and tells us that the "old temporiser," as he styles him, discovered, at last, in December 1545, the favourable moment for opening the council, when the emperor had quarrelled with the chiefs of the Protestant party, and was preparing to make war against them. (i. p. 196.) The real progress of events is so contrary to the system adopted by the author, that nothing but a predilection for his favourite theory could have led him into such palpable mistakes. Cardinal Pallavicini has inserted, in his *History of the Council of Trent*, extracts from the correspondence between the legates of the Pope at Trent and the imperial court, which explain the details of these delays. We happen also to have seen an old and nearly contemporary copy of the letters written by the legates at Trent to Rome, which fully corroborate the account given by the cardinal. The Pope had fixed the 15th of March, 1545, for the opening of the Council,—his legates arrived on the 13th of that month at Trent; but, finding only one bishop, they resolved to wait for the arrival of other bishops. About the beginning of April, he ordered them to open the council at once, in case that any discussion of religious affairs should be introduced at the German diet of Worms;

otherwise, they were commanded to defer the council until a sufficient number of prelates should be present. On the 28th of April, they wrote to the Pope that, notwithstanding a fresh order to open it on the 3rd of May, they would again defer it, as they concurred with Cardinal Farnese, who had passed through Trent, in thinking it prudent to send previous information to the emperor, who had shown himself more favourable to Catholicism, and had declared to the Diet that the affairs of religion should be referred to the council. The Pope still insisted on the opening of it; but the emperor begged for delay at any cost, that he might not be embarrassed in his negotiations with the Protestants in Germany, and might not endanger the Church revenues, of the seizure of which the Spanish prelates would not have failed to complain to the council.* At last, in the month of October, the 13th of December was definitively fixed for opening the council, though the emperor strongly remonstrated, and pressed for farther delay. Where, then, do we discover the cautious delays on the part of the Pope until the emperor should be engaged in differences with the Protestants? On the contrary, did not the Pope command the council to be opened at the very moment when the emperor seemed to lean to the Protestants?† The emperor had not determined to declare war against the Protestants until the middle of the year 1546; and not before the 22nd of June, when the council had been actively employed for a considerable time, was the alliance between the emperor and the Pope concluded.

M. Ranke has also given an incorrect account of the removal of the council from Trent to Bologna (12th March, 1547). He considers it to have been caused by an artifice of the Pope against the emperor, whose recent victories over the Protestants had gained him a dangerous superiority; and asserts that the epidemic which had appeared at Trent was used as a pretext for transferring the council without just grounds (i. p. 252). But we gather from the letters of the legates that they had been from the beginning averse to remaining at Trent; and even on the 16th

* In a letter written on the 7th of August, the legates inform the Pope that the imperial ambassador, Don Diego di Mendoza, had visited them on the preceding day, and declared to them that the emperor stood in absolute need of the 800,000 crowns which he drew from the Church property in Spain under the title of "*CROCCIAE e mezzi frutti*."

† On the 23rd of April, 1545, the legates mention as an important piece of information, that Mignanelli, the nuncio in Germany, held out some hopes of a closer friendship being formed between the Pope and the emperor. Their words are:—“(Mignanelli) mostra, considerare molto che trà Vostra Santità e l'imperadore nascesse qualche confidentia. Questo piacerebbe a noi ancora come cosa più che altro necessaria per beneficio di tutta la Christianità.”

of July 1545, before the opening of the council, they had contemplated its removal to some other city; and during the whole of 1545 and 1546, they earnestly beg the Pope to consent to their wishes, alleging a want of freedom and convenience in a town subject to the emperor, and rendered disagreeable by its proximity to the seat of the war, and the frequent passing of troops through it. The Pope often expresses his disapproval of their request in rather strong terms, but grants them the necessary powers for transferring the Council in extraordinary emergencies. The legates could, therefore, transfer it on the appearance of the epidemic, without previously acquainting the Pope, as he frequently declares in his letters; although the emperor's partizans and many historians have called this fact in question. We may mention, as an incontrovertible proof of our statement, that the legates themselves did not know how the translation would be received at Rome, and it is not until the 4th of April that we find Cardinal Cervini (usually styled from his titular church, the Cardinal of Santa Croce) thanking one of his friends for having conveyed to him the first certain intelligence on the subject.* With regard to the epidemic, which M. Ranke alleges to have been imaginary, we do not lay any stress on the declarations made on oath by the physicians who were consulted by the council, although we cannot discover any cause to suspect their veracity;† but we content ourselves with observing that the French bishops, whose impartiality cannot in this instance be questioned, confirm in their letter to the king‡ the dangerous character of the disease which had broken out.

M. Ranke might have explained, in like manner, several apparent acts of inconsistency in the conduct of the Popes, if he had paid sufficient attention to their spiritual position. A temporal prince might justly be censured for want of firmness and consistency in departing from his usual plan of government; but the Popes were the common fathers of all the faithful, even of those who were then in rebellion against their authority, and, therefore, could not carry on a war of life or death against them. Out of several examples of this paternal feeling on the part of the Popes, which might be cited from the work before us, we select only the following.

M. Ranke informs us at some length that Sixtus V, towards the end of his life, could not come to any decision in his own

* The letter is given by Mansi. *Miscellan.* Baluz. iii. p. 505. The legates advance the same fact in their defence, *ibid.* p. 499.

† The documents connected with their evidence are to be found in the work of the famous Gaetano Marino, *Degli Archiatrj Pontificj.* i. p. 389, ii. p. 291.

‡ The letter is published by Ribier, *Lettres et Mémoires d'Estat,* i. p. 622.

mind as to the propriety of taking any decisive steps in favour of the league against Henry IV, which he had hitherto supported; and he accounts for this indecision by tracing it to the fears of the Pope at the prospect of the invincible superiority which Spain would acquire by adding the conquest of France to their other victories. Still we do not discover, even in M. Ranke's account of the negotiation of Sixtus with Henry IV, a single circumstance unworthy of the vicar of Him who did not come to crush the bruised reed or extinguish the smoking flax.

“ When Luxembourg, the French ambassador, told the Pope that his master would render himself worthy of receiving absolution, and would return to the feet of his Holiness and to the bosom of the Catholic Church, the Pope replied: ‘ Then will I embrace and console him.’ His imagination was already full of the king's conversion, and, on the instant, he formed the most sanguine hopes of effecting it. He thought that political animosity against the King of Spain, rather than a religious conviction of the truth of their own creed, prevented the Protestants from returning to the Catholic Church, and he considered himself bound not to keep them at a distance from him. An English envoy had been sent to Rome, and another was known to be on his way from Saxony. Sixtus V was ready to listen to their requests. ‘ Would to God,’ said he, ‘ that they all return to our feet.’ ”—ii. p. 208.

The feelings of the Pope are more distinctly expressed in other documents, which may be partly considered official. After his conversation with the ambassador of Henry, Sixtus thus explained his motives to the Consistory of Cardinals: “ We assuredly wish to hear every one, and all ought to be listened to by us, who are the father of all and the vicar of Christ. And God grant that she, who is styled the Queen of England, and the Duke of Saxony, and the Turk, may make the same request; we shall be ready to embrace them in all charity.” Afterwards, when the ambassador from the League demanded supplies of money, he replied, “ as long as we thought that the League had been formed to support the cause of religion, we gave, and would give again; but, now, being convinced that it has no other object but ambition, cloaked under a false semblance of religion, you need not any longer expect our protection.” * With such sentiments, the Pope could not fully concur in the plans of Philip II, who displayed greater zeal for the Catholic cause than his Holiness, in order to put his own designs in execution.

Another prominent defect in M. Ranke's work, proceeding from his fundamental principle, springs from his incorrect notion of the relation between the Pope and the Catholic Church. This

* Tempesti. Vita di Sisto V, vol. ii. pp. 280-291, from the acts of the Consistory and MSS. in the Barberini Library.

error may be discovered in the very title of the work: "The Roman Pontiffs, *their* Church and State;" and throughout the work, the author treats of ecclesiastical institutions, as if the Pope could act not less arbitrarily concerning them than concerning temporal matters. As Louis XIV took delight in saying, "The State is myself;" the Pope might say, according to M. Ranke, "The Church is myself." Certainly, every true Catholic might call himself, with noble pride, a Roman Catholic, because he would thereby acknowledge the Holy See to be the centre of the Church; but we claim, in addition, for our Church, the title of Christian and Apostolic. No Pope can establish, and no Pope has ever pretended to establish, any institution, or proclaim any doctrines, save those that are conformable to the apostolic traditions, preserved uncorrupt by the infallibility of the Church.

What, for instance, has M. Ranke proved against the Church, from all the political negotiations that took place during the celebration of the Council of Trent, the accounts of which he parades with so much ostentation? We will not stop to show, that the most honourable conduct was displayed, almost without an exception, on the part of the Papal nuncios; or that the negotiations regarded, for the most part, only points of discipline, or the external circumstances and situation of the council; our opinion may be given in the words of the celebrated Mansi, Archbishop of Lucca, when he republished the correspondence of the Bishop Visconte respecting the council, from which the Protestants had drawn materials for attacking the Church: "Whatever may have been the spirit that influenced each father in giving his vote upon the canons of the council; it is sufficient for us, that they have been approved by the Church to which Christ has promised his assistance—a promise which does not regard each of us individually, but was made to St. Peter as the chief of the Church, and to the Church in union with him."* Indeed, the Church has so little to fear from the publication of these negotiations, that Reynaldi and Pallavicini give many ex-

* "Ex his porro litteris, ajunt Heterodoxi, non ambigüè intelligimus nil nisi humanum Patres Tridentinos sapuisse; nec ad Evangelium, sed ad humanum sensum, oracula illa sua attemperasse. Verüm, falsi illi quidem sunt, nec enim satis attendere voluerunt, Deum, cüm Ecclesiæ prospecturum se pollicitus est, ne quid, in dogmatibus tradendis, falleret et falleretur, hanc se sponsionem fecisse non hominibus quidem privatis, sed Petro ut caput est Ecclesiæ et ipsi pariter Ecclesiæ, cui Ecclesiæ se non defuturum pollicitus est. Quocumque igitur spiritu Patres singuli ducti fuerint in suis definitionibus et Canonibus componendis ac promulgandis, profecto ab Ecclesiâ prodierunt et ab Ecclesiâ recepti sunt, cui se Deus speciali providentiâ affuturum fidem suam obligavit."—Mansi, *Miscellanea Baluziana*, vol. iii. p. 433.

tracts from them;* and other Catholic writers, like Mansi, have published parts of the correspondence in a complete form. On all these points, M. Ranke has done nothing more than copy, frequently almost *verbatim*, the assertions of Paul Sarpi, of whom it will be enough to remark, that his transcriber is unable to justify his sacrilegious conduct, in celebrating mass every day, notwithstanding his convictions in favour of Protestantism.

The sources from which M. Ranke has drawn his facts, have been unknown or nearly inaccessible to foregoing writers. They are chiefly letters written by persons of consequence, ministerial documents, and, above all, the despatches and papers of the Venetian ambassadors, during their stay at Rome, or at other courts; and only where unpublished documents have failed him, has he supplied their want from printed books; as we collect from occasional quotations, and from an inspection of the documents, which fill one half of the third volume. It would, therefore, be extremely difficult to give a detailed criticism on the materials of the work, as the greater part of the documents, to which we should have to refer, are beyond the reach of most of our readers. We must confine ourselves to a very few remarks, lest our paper should exceed the size of the book which we have undertaken to review.

We may, in the first place, observe, that M. Ranke's account of most of the principal events has been derived entirely from the papers of the Venetian ambassadors, whose statements he has not corroborated from other sources more original and more authentic, such as the letters of the persons directly employed in the management of the transactions which he describes. The degree of weight to be attached to such relations should be determined by a critical estimate of these despatches generally, and of the character of the ministers, in particular, who wrote them. Every one who has had occasion to look into diplomatic papers, is well aware, that reliance may be placed on the relation given by an ambassador of any fact which may have occurred during his mission; but when he attempts to penetrate into the designs of the court where he is stationed, and draws conclusions about the consequences likely to result from them, all the prejudices arising from his situation, his feelings towards his sovereign,

* M. Ranke (i. p. 334), attaches much importance to his account of the negotiations between Cardinal Morone and Ferdinand I, derived from newly discovered documents; but we are curious to know if there is a single point of consequence in the whole business which is not much better explained in the history of Pallavicini, *Storia del Concilio di Trento*, Lib. xx. c. 12 et sqq. M. Ranke refrains from quoting Mr. Mendenham's *Memoirs of the Council of Trent*, because, as he justly observes, (vol. iii. p. 289), the author of them has not displayed the learning and study necessary for working out his materials.

and his own character, must be supposed to have weighed with him, and to have influenced his judgment. We are at a loss, therefore, to discover the reason why M. Ranke has received their statements with such implicit belief. His mistakes with regard to the political intentions of the different princes are partly to be traced to this source; as may be easily seen by comparing his second volume, in which original documents have been more frequently consulted, with his first, the value of which is greatly inferior. It would be unfair to insist on several slight mistakes about the literary history of some of these documents: M. Ranke has given some as hitherto inedited, which have been published for many years; but in such an extensive work, these mistakes are unavoidable. We regret, however, that he does not appear to have been acquainted with an important collection of materials for the history of the sixteenth century, published by Mansi, as an appendix to the *Miscellanea of Baluze*;* and that for the history of the Conclaves, his attention has not been directed to the exact accounts of them, which are to be found in the work mentioned below.†

The reader will have judged from our analysis in what manner M. Ranke has used the materials of which we have just spoken. The work consists of general reasonings upon the political events, and of notices respecting the private lives of the Popes; the reader is supposed to be informed of the other facts belonging to their history. On this account, it must be considered as a series of sketches and outlines rather than a complete history; although we allow due weight to the saying of Montesquieu, "*Qui pourrait dire tout sans un mortel ennui?*" We have in vain sought to discover any motive that can have induced the author to treat of some subjects at length and neglect others. In many instances, this method seems to us to have been purely arbitrary. What he has said concerning the time that has elapsed since 1630, is a mere fragment; and there are also omissions of consequence in the preceding portion; for instance, he tells us nothing about the conclave and early actions of Julius III, except an insignificant story; although the acts of the conclave and the first letters of the Pope, which are generally contained in the same MSS. are deserving of particular attention. Julius III was the first Pope who abandoned the system of active interference in political affairs, pursued by most of his predecessors; and proclaimed, on his accession, his resolution to adhere to the

* Stephani Baluzii *Miscellanea*. ed. Mansi Lucæ, 1761-1764, 4 vols. fol. The two last volumes contain the collection alluded to in the text.

† *Notices et Extraits des manuscrits de la Bibliothèque du Roi*. Paris, 1787 et seq. See vol. i. ii.

principle of not mixing in political differences, but of procuring peace, as the common father of all Catholics. He did not enter warmly into the wishes of the imperial party, which, as M. Ranke mentions, would have secured his election; on the contrary, in his instruction to the nuncio at the court of the French king, he says, that to his majesty, after God, he is indebted for it. His resolution not to interfere in political matters, did not prevent him from earnestly and strongly exhorting the emperor and the king to make a mutual peace, and join in alliance against the heretics and the Turks; and he declares, that his own person should not be spared in the performance of his duty towards God and the flock committed to his care.

M. Ranke enters at great length into a history of the Inquisition, and makes martyrs of all the persons condemned by that tribunal, without observing any distinction between criminals condemned by the ordinary tribunals, and the atheists, deists, or heretics, condemned by the Inquisition. At a later period, he is wholly silent about it, and forgets to inform his readers, that the Inquisition relaxed in its severity when the danger was past. We are well aware, that in succeeding times, a number of stories have been related about the terrors of the Inquisition; and many celebrated men are reported to have been tormented by its order, who were never brought before it at all; and the crown of martyrdom has been given to many criminals for no other reason than because they were executed at Rome.*

After this, some doubts may reasonably be entertained as to his exactness in the use of his materials; and the specimens above given, show that his system of political history is like the bed of Procrustes, to which documents are not always fitted without violence. Still, we are very far from charging him with any intentional unfairness; for, on every occasion, where he is not biassed by affection for his system, as when he is treating of the private life of the Popes, or of the internal administration of the Ecclesiastical States, he is much more exact, and the circumstance of any fact being to the credit of the Popes, or honourable to the Catholic Church, does not become with him as with many

* The groundless nature of such charges has been shown on several occasions. Even in the heat of the warfare between Catholics and Protestants, the latter were more just towards the Holy See than our modern writers. Joseph Scaliger, a bitter Calvinist, but one of the most learned men the world has produced, says of Clement VIII:—"The present Pope does not persecute men or put them to death for religion. There have been several Englishmen, but especially one, who, at Rome, in the great temple of St. Peter, during the consecration, snatched the host from the hands of the priest; *and was justly punished for this deed.* The secretary of M. de Dabin has told me that he saw him executed." See "*Scaligeriana sive excerpta ex ore Josephi Scaligeri.*" Hagæ Comit. 1669, 2nd edit. p. 143.

other authors, a good ground for passing it over or disfiguring it. Errors in making references, or faults committed by translating incorrectly, or not observing the context of particular passages, occasionally meet our eye. Our limits do not allow us to raise any points of discussion founded on manuscript authorities; we shall, therefore, mention a few examples taken from sources accessible to all.

M. Ranke (i. p. 255), describes the irritation of the Emperor against the Pope, (Paul III), when the council was transferred from Trent to Bologna, and concludes with these words: "The Emperor not only insisted that the council should return to Trent, but declared farther, that he would go to Rome in person, and there celebrate a council." This expression would have been a violent threat on the part of the Emperor, and a declaration of his intention to direct a hostile expedition against Rome; but in the context of the original document, given by Pallavicini,* the Emperor's words have an entirely different meaning. The Pope had ordered his nuncio to represent to him, that the holding of the council at Bologna, a city belonging to the Pope, would not diminish the liberty of the council, as many councils had been held at Rome itself, and, whenever it might suit him, the Emperor might appoint an interview between himself and his Holiness, to arrange about matters connected with the council; insinuating that, if the Emperor pleased, the council might be held at Rome itself. The Pope's invitation was not very ceremoniously received by the Emperor; who replied, that he would come and hold the council at Rome, whenever it should happen to suit his inclination.†

In another passage, M. Ranke thus speaks of the impression produced on the Catholic princes by the news of the massacre of St. Bartholomew's:—

"Philip II saw with delight, that he had been imitated and surpassed. The Pope, Gregory XIII, celebrated this great success by a procession to St. Louis'; (the national Church of the French in Rome), the Venetians expressed, in a special letter to their ambassador, their satisfaction at this 'grace of God.'"—ii. p. 68.

The conduct of the Pope is narrated in the same line with that of Philip II and the Venetians, without any distinction being marked between them; although, in the annals of Gregory XIII, by Maffei, which, according to M. Ranke himself, contain the most authentic materials for that pontiff's life,—the subject is very differently described.

* Storia x. 19.

† Pallavicini Storia x, 19. "Andarebbe a far il concilio in Roma quando ne avesse talento."

“ At this time, the Pope was personally informed, by the Cardinal of Lorraine, that King Charles, for his own security and the peace of his kingdom, had put to death the Admiral (Coligny), who was the head and the principal supporter of the Huguenots, and, although he had been thus freed from great trouble, still the Pope did not show signs of more than *moderate gratification*, as if a member of his body had been amputated by a painful operation; he returned thanks to the divine goodness at home, and, on the following day, went publicly in solemn procession from St. Mark's to the Church of St. Louis.”*

We are unwilling to multiply examples, and will quote only one interesting passage, relating to our own history. Since the reign of Mary, the Catholics of England and Ireland cherished hopes for the first time under James I of being treated with more justice, and of being, perhaps, even tolerated.

“ Before the accession of James I to the English throne, Clement VIII had caused him to be informed that he prayed for him as the son of a virtuous mother, and that he wished him all temporal and spiritual prosperity, with the hope of one day seeing him again a Catholic. At Rome his accession was celebrated with public prayers and processions. James did not dare to make any reply to these overtures, even if he had been so inclined; but, meanwhile, he allowed Parry, his minister at Paris, to enter on terms of intimacy with the nuncio Bubalis. The nuncio showed him a letter from Cardinal Aldobrandini, exhorting the English Catholics to obey King James as their king and natural lord, and even to pray for him. Parry, in return, produced an instruction from his master, in which he promised to give no trouble to the peaceable Catholics.

“ Indeed the priests began again to say mass publicly in the north of England, and the Puritans complained that within a short time fifty thousand Englishmen had passed over to Catholicism. It is said that the king told them, in answer to their remonstrance, to convert on their side as many Spaniards and Italians. These successes may have betrayed the Catholics into raising their hopes too high. When the king continued to be attached to the other party, and the ancient acts of parliament were enforced anew, the Catholics were proportionably more exasperated, and the gunpowder conspiracy was the terrible result of these feelings. After that event the king could not venture to show any kind of toleration . . . but, when questions about the Catholics were put to him in private, his answers were always very moderate. He said to one of the princes of Lorraine, who had visited him with the privity of Paul V, that the difference between the several creeds was very small,

* In questo tempo avvisato Gregorio personalmente del Cardinale di Lorena, che il Rè Carlo, per sicurezza della sua persona e quiete del regno, aveva fatto tor di vita l'Ammiraglio, capo e fautore principale degli Ugonotti; egli benchè liberato di gravissimo affanno tuttavia come di membra con dolore tagliate dal corpo, mostrando *temperata letizia*, diede di ciò in privato le dovute grazie alla divina bontà, ed il giorno seguente in pubblico con processione da S. Marco andò a visitare la chiesa di San Luigi. “ Maffei Annali di Gregorio XIII, vol. i. p. 34.

and though he held his own faith from conviction and not from motives of policy, he took pleasure in hearing the doctrines of others . . . that he admitted the authority of the Fathers of the Church, and that Augustin had more weight with him than Luther; and St. Bernard more than Calvin, . . . that he considered the Roman Church, even in her present condition, as the mother of all the other Churches, and that she needed only to be reformed . . . that he was neither a heretic, as he held the same doctrine as the Pope, nor a schismatic, as he allowed the Pope to be the head of the Church."—ii. p. 479, *et seq.**

With such sentiments, continues M. Ranke, and for political reasons likewise, the king sought to conciliate the Catholics, who were yet numerous and were inclined to join the Spaniards; and he expected to succeed in all his views, if his son, the hereditary prince Charles, should marry a princess of Spain. This alliance would also enable him to reinstate in his dominions his brother-in-law, the elector of Pfalz, who had lost his electoral possessions by his defeat in Bohemia. The conclusion of this affair is well known; the king of Spain consented, the Pope granted the necessary dispensation, the marriage articles were determined, when the quarrel between Buckingham and Olivarez caused the plan to fall to the ground. M. Ranke has explained these points with sufficient clearness, but he has not pointed out the difference between the conditions of the treaty of marriage, which were made public, and those which were *secretly* agreed to by the king. Nor is the conduct of the Pope sufficiently brought to view. To render the account of this important transaction complete, we shall endeavour to supply what our author has omitted.

We have in our possession a MS. memoir, intended no doubt for the Pope, and entitled, *Considerazioni dalle quali si conosce dover esser utile il matrimonio alla religione Cattolica*. The writer in the first place expresses his hope that the princess would very easily succeed in converting to the Catholic faith her husband, who was still young, and, as he judged, not gifted with great prudence (*di natura non advedutissimo*). Although no guarantee had yet been given for the performance of the promises made to the Catholics, the importance of the negotiation might be gathered from the fact, that within that period the Catholics had converted ten thousand Protestants. The king had, moreover, for reasons of state favoured the marriage, not relying on the fidelity of his subjects, who differed from him in religion, and wishing to secure the crown to his son by the power of the Spanish king. The memoir farther states that the *Puritans*

* M. Ranke in this account has consulted the two documents entitled, *Breve relazione di quanto si è trattato trà S. Santità ed il Rè d'Inghilterra*, and *Relazione del Signor de Breval al Papa*.

hated the king more than ever, on account of the marriage, and this circumstance would oblige him more earnestly to seek the alliance with Spain, and come to terms with the Catholics, by granting them liberty of conscience, and forming them into a party in his kingdom to counterbalance the Puritans. The papal nuncio at Madrid, Mgr. Massimi, Bishop of Bertinoro, had also expressed his approval of the match; and on the 12th of April, 1623, Cardinal Ludovisi forwarded to him the dispensation which had been previously examined by a congregation of five cardinals. The instructions, hitherto unpublished, sent at the same time to the nuncio, were two-fold, public and secret; in the former the pope enjoined the nuncio not to give the dispensation until he should have obtained from the privy council (*consiglio*) and the parliament, their approval of the toleration promised to the Catholics; but in the secret instructions, the nuncio is informed that the pope approves of the conditions of the treaty, in the form already agreed to by the two kings, and only requires that the king of Spain shall guarantee by letters patent (*cedola reale*) the performance of the promises of the king of England, and promise in the name of the infanta that she should not keep any Protestant attendant in her service. If these demands were allowed, the nuncio was to deliver the dispensation, but he was likewise to endeavour to obtain the following conditions:—1st. That the children should be baptized by a Catholic priest according to the Catholic rite; 2d. That they should remain until their twelfth year under the care of their mother; and this term was, if possible, to be prolonged for two years more; 3d. That the toleration promised to the Catholics should not be limited to the infanta and her suite, but should extend to all the other Catholics in the king's dominions, who had been persecuted for so long a time. The conditions that were finally agreed to by the parties are well known, but it is interesting to observe how much they recede from the conditions originally proposed.

We dare not hazard an opinion respecting the style of the work. It is read with greater facility than the generality of German works, but we are struck in every page with the author's efforts to produce an effect, or strike out a happy thought, *etiam invitâ Minervâ*. The narration is much enlivened by M. Ranke's endeavours to imprint on it a local character, by relieving it with descriptions of several parts of Rome, which evince a sincere attachment to the Eternal City. The antiquarian reader will only regret that in speaking of Roman antiquities, M. Ranke is seldom correct. In the first volume (p. 473), he tells us that Sixtus V brought the ancient Aqua Martia from the Colonna territory, over twenty-two miles of country, to Rome.

It happens, however, that the sources of the aqueduct of Sixtus V have nothing to do with the ancient Aqua Martia, which is brought from the Sabine hills, more than sixty miles from Rome. In another passage (iii. p. 76), he states that the Temple of Peace (or more correctly the Basilica of Constantine), was in a good state of preservation as late as the reign of Paul V, who led the way to its destruction, by removing the great column, which stands at present before the church of St. Mary Major. This is likewise incorrect. Any one examining the former site of the column, may convince himself that its removal could not cause the ruin of the building, which as we see in ancient representations of it, was in a state of decay before the time of Paul V. A few lines afterwards, the stone of which the famous tomb of Cæcilia Metella, at Rome, is built, is called "marble;" although in the era of the republic, to which the tomb belongs, it was never customary to use marble for such a monument, which, unluckily, is built of Travertine.

We should exceed the limits of an article, and fatigue the patience of our readers, if we did not close here our critical observations. We have proved, we trust, that the history of the popes since the Reformation is not completed, much less perfectly described in the work to which we have dedicated this article; and on account of this very incompleteness, we cannot look upon it, as some Catholic and Protestant reviewers have done, as extremely prejudicial to the Catholic Church. Besides, the popes are the "best abused men" in all history, so that, to use M. Ranke's own words (Pref. p. 11), "It is impossible for the most scrutinizing research to discover any facts worse than those which unfounded conjecture has already invented, and which men have once held as truth." Although we could have reasonably wished our author to have based his researches on other principles, we are still convinced that every Catholic is indebted to him for what he has already done. He proves anew the credibility of Catholic authors, such as Tempesti and Maffei, and he has laid open the falsehoods of our adversaries. Who has not seen the works of Gregorio Leti quoted as an incontrovertible authority in proof of the vices of Sixtus V, or the debauchery of Innocent X? M. Ranke demonstrates his narration to be destitute of foundation, and to have been compiled from a very modern collection of trifling stories, which he intentionally rendered still more fabulous. Besides these results, which are rather of a negative character, we find in M. Ranke's work a multitude of facts heretofore almost unknown, which are highly creditable to the Church and the Holy See. This is the first time that a Protestant, enjoying a reputation for eminent literary

acquirements, who has devoted to this subject the results of long researches, and consulted the relations of eye-witnesses usually impartial, or whose partialities are against the popes, has published to the world his candid acknowledgment that the popes of these latter times have been in their private lives spotless and unblameable; that many of them have been models of virtue and piety; and that all of them were ready to sacrifice everything for the safety of the Church; in a word, that, after God, we owe to the popes the preservation of Catholicism on this side of the Alps. The historians and political writers who attribute to them the ruin of the nationality and liberty of Italy, may learn from the work before us that the feelings of Italian nationality lived in the hearts of the popes, and urged them to make the greatest sacrifices, when the other Italian states had deserted the cause. We challenge the world to point out in any dynasty of Europe two or three such men as filled the Holy See in continuous succession during an equal space of time.*

-
- ART. III.—1. *A Grammar of Modern Geography, with an Introduction to Astronomy and the Use of the Globes; compiled for the Use of King's College School.* By Aaron Arrowsmith. London. 1832.
2. *Pinnock's Catechism of the History of England; written in easy Language for the Use of Young Persons.* Fifty-second Edition. London.
3. *Pinnock's Improved Edition of Goldsmith's History of England.* Twenty-fourth Edition. London. 1835.
4. *A Comprehensive Grammar of Modern Geography and History.* By William Pinnock, Author of *Pinnock's Catechisms*, &c. London.
5. *Titi Livii Historiæ Libri omnes qui extant, cum annotationibus probatissimis et utilissimis, accuratè selectis, et Anglicè redditis, à Jacobo Prendeville, Universitatis Dubliniensis Scholare.* Tomus primus, in usum scholarum. Dublinii. 1828.

AT the commencement of our literary labours, we pledged ourselves to examine the origin, and expose the injustice, of the prejudices too commonly entertained against the principles

* Since writing the above article, we learn that a French translation of M. Ranke's work has been published in two volumes, under the following title, *Histoire de la Papauté pendant les seizième et dix-septième siècles, par Leopold Ranke, &c. précédée d'une Introduction par M. Alex. de St. Ch . . .*, 8vo.

and practice of the Catholic Religion. In the fulfilment of this pledge, it becomes our duty to call the attention of the public to the character of the school-books in general use: and, although in introducing mere elementary treatises to their notice, we depart somewhat from the ordinary routine of our contemporaries, we feel, notwithstanding, that, to those who duly appreciate the purity and integrity of early education, it would be idle to offer either explanation or apology.

If it be correct to suppose that any class is peculiarly interested in a matter of such importance to all, we have little hesitation in saying, that all who profess the Protestant principle, if they wish to be consistent, are bound to guard the education of youth with far more than ordinary care. Glorifying in the inalienable privilege of private judgment in religion;—claiming its freedom as the most precious birthright of man;—denouncing, in the strongest terms, “the scandalous decrees”* which would fetter its exercise;—it would be, in them, a strange inconsistency indeed, to permit a system of education for their children, which, by filling the infant mind with prejudice, renders a fair inquiry in after-life exceedingly difficult, if not almost impossible. Who will say that the youth who has been led from infancy to class together “the apostacies of Rome and Mahomet;”† to lisp of the “absurd creed” of Catholics; whose mind has been filled with horror of their religion, as a “system of imposture, deceit, and falsehood,” “shocking to the natural reason of thinking men,”‡ and taught to shrink with loathing from the “shocking and disgusting details of the Papal supremacy;”§—who will say that he is prepared for a fair and dispassionate comparison of the claims of the Catholic and Protestant churches? Still less, if he find the belief of Catholics misrepresented; if he find the images of the saints perpetually called “Idols;”|| if he be told, that their “pretended” indulgences are a real “permission to commit sin?”¶—is not this (we put it to the common sense of our Protestant countrymen)—is not this a cruel mockery of that “unfettered liberty of mind” which, in the case contemplated, becomes an empty, foolish boast! and is not the parent who tolerates such a system, a partner and accomplice in the alienation of the “inalienable birthright” of his child?

The literature of England is Anti-catholic by prescription—Anti-catholic in all its departments. To be sure, the day is past when, in every romance, the reader found a “ruffian monk” with a reeking dagger or a poisoned bowl; and the villain of

* Arrowsmith's Geography, p. 163.

§ Ibid. p. 165.

† Ibid. p. 161.

|| Ibid. p. 168.

‡ Ibid. p. 163.

¶ Ibid. p. 164.

every plot was a crafty Jesuit or hypocritical priest: but the poison is administered still, with a more delicate, it is true, but not less busy hand. From the lordly folio down to the almost invisible diamond edition, it may still be found in every shop and upon every stall: Dr. Fletcher's estimate of the candour of Protestant writers on divinity, is too well known to be repeated here; but, in truth, the spirit is universal—common to history, fiction, and even science, as well as divinity. We have seen a metaphysician gravely assert, that transubstantiation was an invention of the schools, to explain Aristotle's theory of absolute accidents. We have known a medical lecturer insult his hearers, many of whom were Catholics, by an irrelevant and offensive episode on the corruptions and superstition of the middle age.* The truth is, this unworthy spirit breathes through them all; theologian and encyclopædist; novelist and historian: it may even be heard lisping in the honeyed numbers of some fair authoress, or found lurking under the gilded decorations of a scrap-book or an annual!

But it were well if the evil stopped here. There is some chance that the readers to whom it is thus introduced, may be capable of examining for themselves; and although it is difficult to conceive how one can close his mind against insinuations which he meets at every turn, still, speaking absolutely, their case is not without some hope of remedy. But there is another field, in which the mischief is incalculably greater,—we mean, the first lessons of youth. Accustomed, more or less, to judge for itself, and feeling a degree of pride in its own powers, the full-grown intellect is apt to receive with suspicion any new or startling statement: and we may hope that, if anything be admitted after imperfect examination, it will retain but slight hold should its falsehood be afterwards detected. But the young mind, in its first adventurous journey into the regions of knowledge, clings to every support which is offered to its tottering steps, with a tenacious, because all-confiding, grasp, which it scarcely relinquishes even in its fall. Each one's experience will convince him

“Quo semel est imbuta recens servabit odorem
Testa diu;”

and, with the memory of our own early misconceptions drawn from this very source, we have little difficulty in accounting for the prejudice which marks the character of a large section of the community.

* The students who attended certain lectures in this metropolis during the session 1835-6, will recollect the occasion.

We do not mean, within the limits of an article like the present, to run through all the treatises used in our schools. We feel that it would be impossible, as, indeed, it is unnecessary. Seeking not so much to point out every abuse as to shew the necessity of a general reform, we shall content ourselves with producing a few specimens of their general tendency, satisfied that, in a matter with which the dearest interests of the community are identified, the radical defects to which attention may be directed, cannot long remain without a remedy.

We will commence with a book of the humblest class—"a spelling and pronouncing dictionary"—the very last, we should have supposed, which could have been employed for the purpose of misrepresentation. There are few walks in literature more circumscribed than that assigned to the compiler of a dictionary, "the pioneer of literature, destined only to remove rubbish, and clear obstructions from its paths." To give an explanation, as far as possible "the reciprocal of the thing explained," is the fundamental law laid down by one of the greatest masters of the art. Every one laughs at finding the grave Dr. Johnson betrayed by his anti-Scotch prepossessions into the semblance of humour, describing oats as "grain which in *England* is used for horses, but in *Scotland* is the food of the people." There, however, if there be not much humour, at least there is not much harm, in the joke. But what shall we say of the petty malice of the following explanation:—

"ANTICHRIST, One who opposes Christ—THE POPE"!!

And this in a "spelling and pronouncing dictionary for the use of schools," printed and reprinted year after year! We ourselves copy it from a *stereotype edition*, intended, of course, to perpetuate the absurdity!* It is difficult to treat seriously a matter so utterly ridiculous. Such things may do very well for the fanatical exhibitions of the Rotunda. There we may laugh at the virulence which defeats its own object. But it is a disgrace to the character of our schools, to find, in the sober pages of a dictionary, that "*Antichrist*" means "*the Pope*," set down with as much seriousness, and as little ceremony, as that "king" means "monarch," or "Christian" "one who professes the religion of Christ."

The observations which we have been making above, apply, with peculiar force, to the little series entitled "Pinnock's Catechisms," which, if we may judge from the number of editions,

* *Entick's Spelling and Pronouncing Dictionary*, stereotype edition, Sims and M'Intire, Belfast.

seems to have met an enormous circulation.† “Intended,” as the advertisement states, “to be committed to memory at an early age, they form a complete juvenile cyclopedia, written in simple and easy language;” and profess to contain a familiar epitome of the principles of almost every conceivable subject: grammar, history, science, and religion. As they are intended to direct the very earliest judgments of the pupil, it is obvious that the greatest care should have been taken, to avoid the slightest taint of prejudice. Let the reader judge whether it be so.

Let us take for example, the “*Catechism of English History*.” It is scarcely necessary to say, that, in the colouring of facts and the estimate of character, the compendium follows implicitly the authorities of Hume and Goldsmith: and it need not be added, that, in an elementary epitome, which deals only with leading facts, any misrepresentation, however slight, is much more censurable. A very few examples will suffice to display its spirit.

“Q. What is meant by the Reformation?”

“A. By the Reformation is meant the *reforming* of the Christian religion from *the errors* of popery, and reducing it nearer to its primitive purity.” p. 43.

Where, we would ask, is the necessity for this gratuitous insult? It may be said, that the book was intended for Protestants only. If so, what would have been more easy than to say, “By the Reformation, *Protestants mean*?” But did the writer forget, that even they, in his own principles, are bound by a most sacred obligation, to decide for themselves the truth or falsehood of these very doctrines which he would teach them in infancy to regard as “errors?” Is it possible he could have imagined, that prepossessions such as these, adhering with all the tenacity peculiar to the first faith of childhood, were a good preparation for an unprejudiced and self-led conclusion? To the Catholic child such things are but an insult; and, Heaven knows, we have had experience enough to teach us to bear them patiently; but to the Protestant, whose principles oblige him to form his own religious faith, they are a positive and a grievous injustice. Every reflecting man must see the difficulty of reconciling the practice of early polemical instruction with the free exercise of private judgment. But if it must be done, even at the expense of consistency, in the name of common decency, let it be confined to the books which are set

† The *Catechism of English History* has reached at least the fifty-second edition.

apart for that purpose. Let not the youthful student meet it at every turn; still more, let him not meet it in its too frequent form, misrepresentation. Above all, let not the Catholic be insulted upon ground which is common to both, and which, if the courtesies of life are to be observed between them, should unquestionably be neutral.

In page 84, we are told that "marriage was first celebrated in churches in the reign of Henry III; and the writer adds, with a *sang froid* which, if the subject were any other, might provoke a smile, that "magnifying glasses and magic lanterns were *also* invented in that reign by Roger Bacon the monk!" We looked with some degree of curiosity to the account of the Gunpowder Plot, a subject, with writers of this class, so fertile in misrepresentation.

"Q. What was the Gunpowder-plot?"

"A. A scheme of the Roman Catholics to blow up both houses of Parliament, when the king, princes, lords, and commons, should be assembled, Nov. 5, 1605."

The Gunpowder Plot a scheme of the Roman Catholics! The public is in possession of all the circumstances of this atrocious conspiracy, as far as they can be gathered from the mass of contradictions in which the policy of the minister, and the excitement of the period, has involved it. It is for any unprejudiced man to judge, how far the history of the case bears out the effort which, in common with his more distinguished brethren, this miniature-historian makes to fix upon it the character of a conspiracy of the *entire Catholic party*.† That the statement and the form of the expression are not accidental, may appear sufficiently from a more extended compendium of English history by the same author, in which the same statement is put forward at greater length.

"Mild as this monarch was in toleration, there was a project contrived in the very beginning of his reign, for the re-establishment of popery, which, were it not a fact known to all the world, could scarcely be credited by posterity. This was the Gunpowder Plot, than which a more horrid or terrible scheme never entered into the human heart to conceive.

† Most of the Catechisms in the series are of the same stamp. Even in the *Catechism of Religious Denominations*, which professes to avoid everything "tending to bias the opinions of the rising generation before they have attained an age capable of judging for themselves," we find first, in the list of "fundamental doctrines (p. 16) on which most Christians are agreed," that "the Scriptures are divinely inspired, and the *only certain rule of faith and practice*;" while the writer admits (p. 33), that the number of Catholics, who reject this article, far exceeds that of Protestants.

“*The Roman Catholics* had expected great favour and indulgence on the accession of James, both as the descendant of Mary, a rigid Catholic, and also as having shewn some partiality to that religion in his youth. But *they (the Roman Catholics, of course)* soon discovered their mistake, and were at once surprised and enraged, to find James on all occasions express his resolution of strictly enforcing all the laws against them. This declaration determined *them (the Roman Catholics still)* upon more desperate measures; and *they* at length formed a resolution of destroying the King and both houses of Parliament at a blow. The scheme was first broached by Robert Catesby, a gentleman of good parts and ancient family, who conceived that a train of gunpowder might be placed under the Parliament-house, so as to blow up the King and all the members at once. How horrid soever the contrivance might appear, yet *every member* seemed faithful and secret in the league.”—pp. 219, 220.

It is impossible to mistake the meaning of this passage. Not a word to convey any idea of the number of the conspirators—not a single allusion to their character or station. On the contrary, tracing its origin to the disappointed hopes and aggrieved condition of *the entire body*, the author mixes up *all alike* in the charge. The circumstances may be detailed with sufficient minuteness; but is it not outrageous, to represent as the act of the entire Catholic body, an attempt of which only *sixteen individuals*, of comparatively unimportant station, were cognizant; which is repugnant to every principle of their creed, and was undertaken, as has been proved beyond the possibility of doubt, in defiance of the earnest remonstrances of the three priests to whom, under the seal of confession, the fatal secret was confided?

If our space permitted, we would submit a few extracts in a similar strain from Goldsmith, and an abridgment of Hume which is in pretty general use. As it is, our readers being in all probability sufficiently familiar with both, we must suffer them to draw upon the memory of their schoolboy studies. We will, therefore pass on to examine briefly the class-books of geography, which are equally, if not more objectionable. To the mere geographical details this observation will not apply; but the history and statistics mixed up in the work are but too often made the vehicle of the worst misrepresentation. This character, we regret to say, is very general. Guthrie, Guy, Pinnock, Goldsmith, Arrowsmith, and many others, might be taken as examples.

We shall commence with a few extracts from the last-named work, compiled for the use of King's College school. We do not think it necessary to offer a single comment.

“The Christian religion was not introduced into Germany before the eighth century; but that country had the honour of taking the lead in

the Reformation, about A. D. 1517: prior to this latter period, the bishops, whilst they were possessed of enormous power and revenues, were buried in the profoundest ignorance and the grossest wickedness and superstition. This new and important era in the history of Germany, which rescued not only it, but the whole Christian world, from *the foul idolatries of popery*, was introduced by Martin Luther, whose name can never be forgotten whilst anything of principle remains that is deserving of remembrance. This great man was born at Eislchen in Saxony, in the year 1483: he spent the early years of his life in the most diligent study, and having passed some time in a convent of the Augustine friars, he assumed the habit and took the vows of that order, and was at length ordained a priest when twenty-four years of age. His great and profound learning, the sanctity of his moral conduct, and his extensive acquaintance with the Holy Scriptures, were generally known and applauded; and in the following year, the Elector of Saxony having founded a university at Wittenberg, appointed Luther to the professorship of philosophy, and afterwards to that of divinity.

“This took place during the pontificate of Leo X. The unbounded profusion of this pope in every object of expense, attached to a taste for luxurious magnificence, rendered it necessary to devise means for replenishing his exhausted treasury; and one of those which occurred, was the *sale* of certain indulgences which his *apostate Church* claimed a right of dispensing from the store of her spiritual wealth. These indulgences *pretended* to convey to the possessor either the pardon of his *own sins*, or the release from purgatory of any one already dead, in whose happiness he was interested. The commissaries appointed for this *blasphemous traffic* in Germany, executed their trust with such shameless and disgusting effrontery, and exaggerated the efficacy of their wares in such very extravagant terms, as gave great offence to those who were even ordinarily pious and thoughtful. At last the iniquity of such proceedings roused the anger of Luther, a public preacher at Wittenbeg, who felt himself insulted by such a system, and knew that his lessons of religion and morality could be valued but little, whilst the Church whose disciple he was so openly *encouraged the commission of the grossest vices*.”—pp. 108-9.

“Though many superstitious practices and unscriptural opinions had debased the purity of the early faith, there can be no comparison between the state of religious error when the grant of Phocas conferred political power on the Roman Pontiff, and the extent to which the *system of imposture, deceit, and falsehood*, subsequently attained, by the time when the Council of Trent impressed its seal on the great charter of papal slavery. The published works of Pope Leo, who sent Augustine to England, prove that the religious faith of that day *was essentially different*, in the most important doctrines, from the creed which was sanctioned by the Council of Trent. The doctrines of solitary masses, masses for the dead, transubstantiation, the supremacy of the Pope, the equal authority of scripture and tradition, the equal authority of the apocryphal with the canonical books of scripture, the power of good works to deserve salvation, the confession of sins in private to the priest,

communion in one kind only, and the worship of images, were all condemned by Pope Leo; and were all decreed to be articles of faith, and as such, to be implicitly believed on pain of damnation, by the Council of Trent. This remarkable fact destroys at once the truth of the assertion so generally made, that the Church of Rome has maintained an unchangeable creed. *The faith of that Church is an embodied collection of true and false opinions*; partly derived from misinterpreted scripture, but principally invented in the course of the controversies and discussions which have ever prevailed in the world, and which would have escaped from the memory of mankind, with other absurdities of the age of ignorance, if they had not been preserved, and sanctioned and enforced by the asserted infallibility of the most fallible Church upon earth.

“ From the grant of Phocas to the age of Luther, the annals of Europe are filled with *one long catalogue of crime produced by the influence of the corruptions of the Church of Rome*. The depositions of princes, the fomenting of rebellions, the flagitious lives of the popes, the scandalous decrees against the freedom of opinion, the persecution of the objectors to the power of Rome, which disgrace this sad portion of the history of the world, have been amply and frequently related. The friends of the Church of Rome had long endeavoured to effect its reformation before the age of Luther; indignant remonstrances, the most energetic appeals, the most affecting entreaties, the most bitter and galling satire were alike in vain exerted to induce the removal of abuses. *The natural reason of thinking men was shocked at the consequences of the papal doctrines*. In this state of things, the injudicious enforcement of one of the more objectionable doctrines of its *absurd creed*, elicited the spark which fired the long prepared train of public indignation. *Permissions to commit sin were publicly sold under the pretence of remitting the penalties of the guilt which their commission would have contracted*: the open and shameless manner in which these indulgences were sold, together with the quarrel between the rival societies of monks, who were desirous of participating in the profits of the scandalous traffic occasioned that gradual, open and indignant opposition to the Church of Rome, which ended in the alienation of its fairest provinces, and the restoration of that pure religion and unfettered liberty of mind, which it had been amongst the original objects of Christianity to secure to its adherents. It cannot be as the successor of an apostle, that this priest invests himself with the powers of an absolute monarch, over the lives and property of thousands of human beings in this world, and over their happiness in a future state; that he clothes himself with purple; that he assumes a triple crown, as representing his pretended triple capacity of high-priest, supreme judge, and sole legislator of the Christians; that he surrounds himself with all the insignia and splendour of royalty, which his feeble means admit of; that he is shrouded with all the pomp of magistracy, and the destructive machinery of war. It requires some patience to follow him through *such a tissue of hypocrisy*, and to find him, notwithstanding, assuming the humble title of “servant of the servants of God;” but the whole

details of his *assumed supremacy are shocking and disgusting indeed.*" —pp. 163,-4,-5.

We shall not trust ourselves with any observation upon this insolent and offensive tirade. But we cannot help asking, what has all this to do with the geography of Italy? We put it to the good feeling of any man, however stern in his belief, whether any good is likely to result, either to charity or to religion, from such a tissue of falsehood, misrepresentation and abuse; and what peace can be expected in society from an education, where such principles are, not merely sanctioned, but encouraged?

Again, what could be more insulting than the following passage? Speaking of the shrine of Our Lady at Loretto, he describes it as "a speculation, which has answered amazingly well. The number of devotees who visit it for the purpose of absolving themselves from vows, obtaining relief from sickness or other distress, and seeking remission of their sins, is very great; before the reformation it is said that more than 200,000 pilgrims visited the shrine annually, and laid at the feet of THE IDOL the best offerings they were able to present."—p. 168.

A thousand, and a thousand times, have Catholics, with one voice, disclaimed this revolting imputation; a thousand and a thousand times, has the charge been repeated, as we find it here. Surely these slanderers are of that class predicted in Isaias, who "hearing, hear and understand not," who "see the vision and know it not."

We can only refer the reader to the observations upon Spain, (pp. 89, 90) upon Portugal, (p. 97) and Naples, (p. 171.) They are exactly in keeping with the above, equally unworthy of any liberal or enlightened mind.

The author of the Elementary Catechisms noticed above, has also published a grammar of Geography, which seems to have been favourably received. We were sorry to meet it occasionally in Catholic schools, even of considerable respectability.

The following false and scandalous passage, no matter what might be its other merits, should have decided its exclusion.

"The government of the Roman States is that of an absolute elective monarch, generally aged, who is called the Pope. The Popes being formerly the acknowledged head of all the Christian world except the Greek Church, possessed a power of which we can scarcely have any idea: although it is now greatly diminished, yet, as their history still continues to be connected with that of most countries of Europe, it is proper that attention be paid to the following observations.

"In Italy the Pope is considered a respectable temporal power, as governing a pretty extensive territory; but he is *very arbitrary*, and his subjects, (as those of all ecclesiastics) groan under the weight of enormous taxes; for, as the sovereign bishop is always old, he loses no time

to advance his family ; and before, or as soon as this is done, he dies, and the same scene is reacted by another.

“ The Pope is styled by way of eminence His Holiness, and affects to be above all temporal princes ; for which reason he wears three crowns upon his tiara ; and, not content with being styled sovereign prince, he *pretends* to be Vicar of Jesus Christ upon earth.

“ The Roman Catholic Religion is the only one tolerated throughout the Pope's dominions. *The Pope's sons are called his nephews*, and the custom of enriching them Nepotism.”—pp. 222, 3.

We could scarce trust our eyes, when we read for the first time this frontless calumny, and it is not without considerable reluctance we transfer it to our pages. It is hard to speak with common patience of such men and such things. The more courageous class of slanderers, who prepare their falsehoods for the adult portion of the community, and advance them in the full daylight of literature, where they meet the chances of examination and exposure—these we can meet in their own field—we can despise, or pity, or disregard. But the seducers of the youthful mind, the poisoners of the first milk of knowledge, we know not how to treat,—we know not with what arms to meet, as we are in doubt with what feelings to regard them. Naturalists tell of an insect, which deposits its egg within the shell of the almond while it is yet tender. The embryo comes into life, finds its food prepared, and destroying the vegetable life to which it owes its own, at length acquires strength to burst its way through the shell which has gradually hardened around it. But here the process of moral corruption is still more complete. The foul deposit of prejudice, which is thus introduced into the mind becomes itself the agent by which the better feelings of the heart are hardened ; it builds up an impenetrable wall, through which no light of knowledge can enter ; and the energies of that mind, which Providence destined for a wider sphere, are wasted and perish within the narrow circle which was marked out while it was yet unable to select for itself. And these men talk of the “inalienable right” of private judgment, and glory in its imagined exercise ! As well call the blind man to admire the exquisite shades of a painting, or the rich and varied hues of an insect or a flower !—From the tone of the extract given above, we need not be surprised to find the writer exulting in the prospect of the speedy downfall of Papal power, and assuring the reader, that “His Holiness is now treated, even by the Roman Catholic princes, with little more ceremony than is due to him as *Bishop of Rome* and as possessed of a temporal Principality ; and it is reasonable to suppose, he will ere long be reduced to the exercise of his ecclesiastical functions only.”

Another author* more cautiously insinuates, that “the stability of both his spiritual and temporal kingdoms has been shaken to its very centre, though, of that colossal power which it was the work of ages to erect, it will take *some time yet* to complete the final overthrow.” We are not alarmed by these predictions, confident as is their tone. The majesty of age hangs around the eternal city—the same holy unseen watchman still guards her consecrated hills—from her hoary watch-towers still echoes the same mysterious call :—

“Tutti tornate alla gran Madre antica !”

The character of the Spaniards and Neapolitans is such as one might expect from the general tone of the book. But we must say that we were scarcely prepared to hear, of a people whom we know from other sources than the report of the tourist or the geographer, that “the manner of life of the lower Irish is but little removed *from that of a savage*, and their ignorance is extreme,” though “the *higher orders* are noted for their bravery and generous hospitality.” Either the author presumed on the flattered pride of the “higher orders,” for indulgence with regard to the rest of the character, or we must suppose him to have set their judgment at defiance, as completely as another writer† of the same stamp disregards our powers of vision, assuring us gravely, that “the complexion of Irish females of the lower order *resembles the colour of smoked ham*” !! Heaven help us ! not even our personal appearance can escape ! This is even worse than Tasso’s character of our forefathers, “*irsuti*,” “hairy-men.”

“Questi de l’alte selve *irsuti* manda
La divisa del mondo ultima Irlanda.”

Although the subject has led us already much farther than we anticipated or intended, we cannot refrain, notwithstanding, from producing one other example. The field of classic literature was long free from sectarian animosity. It seems to have ever been, even to the most angry polemic, what it was to Cicero in his day—a place of relaxation, where all bitterness was forgotten—*ubi aures convivio defessæ conquiescant*. Sometimes its weapons were pressed into the service of rival commentators ; but, on the whole, there was but little bitterness in their use. The mysterious *procul este profani* seems to have retained its influence. Men

* Guy’s Geography, p. 76.

† Goldsmith’s Geography, for the use of schools and young persons. It is needless to multiply examples. What connexion there may be between the study of geography, and phrases such as “Monkish ignorance,” “iniquities of priestcraft, tyranny of Rome” &c. (Guy pp. 50-66, &c.) we willingly profess ourselves unable to divine.

entered upon these studies with the feelings of the initiated ; and, carried back to the period when these differences were yet unknown, they were beguiled into a momentary forgetfulness of their existence. However there are some instances of a contrary disposition ; and to us the following appears to be a remarkable one.

Some years since an edition of Livy, with English notes, was published in Dublin, by Mr. James Prendeville, Scholar, T.C.D. We do not mean to consider its merits as a compilation here. Still keeping in view that relation of the subject which we have been hitherto discussing, we mean simply to call attention to the *Preface*, or the *Life of Livy*, into which the editor has contrived to introduce the exploded charge against St. Gregory the Great: although he seems to have some misgivings, that, to adopt his own words, it is not quite “pertinent” to the subject.

He is accounting, in an ill-tempered and worse written introduction, for the mutilation of his author :—

“When the empire was dismembered, and the chair of the Pontiff seated in the place of the throne of the Cæsars, *the tolerant and sober spirit of the Gospel was for a time forgotten*, and the dark and sullen genius of superstition, that is ever deaf to the voice of reason, and shrinks with horror from the light of knowledge, ruled the world. Then a false and mischievous zeal for religion completed the devastation of unlettered barbarism. *The monks of that period were foremost in the crusade against literature*, though afterwards it must be confessed it owed obligations to some of them. And Pope Gregory the Great, one of that order, that he *may*, ‘at one fell swoop,’ abolish all heathen recollections and heathen learning, in a pious fury set fire to the Palatine library, the great arsenal of all the learning of antiquity, and burned it to ashes. It is said Livy was the chief object of his holy animosity.”—pp. 12-13.

He continues to detail the work of destruction in the East, under the followers of Mahomet, the burning of the library of Alexandria, &c., and concludes from all, taken together :—

“So that so far from enquiring, why *the works* of these great lights of antiquity, those fathers and ornaments of history, poetry, science, and philosophy, whose very names are enough to awaken high emotions, have not been *wafted down the stream of time*, our wonder should be, that a single fragment had been saved from the universal wreck, made by barbarians, infidels, monks, and fanatics.”

For this clumsy charge against St. Gregory, as well as the general accusation, in which he connects monks with infidels, fanatics, and barbarians, Mr. P. produces no authority. He does not think it necessary to offer a single reference. It would be impossible to throw a greater air of certainty around the narrative of the destruction of Carthage, or the building of Rome:

not a single word of doubt, not a particle of hesitation. The existence of the Palatine library could not be told more confidently than its destruction by order of St. Gregory is recounted here. Why, we would ask, does he not produce his authority? Why not allow his readers to judge for themselves? Shall we say, he dared not? He must have known, or if he knew not, his temerity in preferring such a charge, without examination, is no less censurable—that the tale is not told positively by any writer of respectability; and that even those who support it most strenuously, betray, by their efforts to render it plausible, the weakness of the ground on which it rests. Among the retailers of calumny at second-hand it has long been current, and, perhaps, with some it may have acquired credit enough to warrant a brief examination.

We might content ourselves with a negative refutation. A charge, which the enemies of Christianity, the habitual revilers of the Fathers of the Church, left, as they found, without confirmation, may be well presumed really destitute of authority. Where the researches of Bayle, of Barbeyrac, of Gibbon, have been without success, there is little chance that a writer, who does not refer even to these, will add much weight by his unsupported assertion. We shall begin with Bayle. To appreciate properly the value of his testimony, when it is favourable to St. Gregory, it is only necessary to glance at the article (Gregoire I) from which we quote. Nothing can exceed its virulence. Every action misrepresented, every motive misconstrued—all the slanders of former calumniators extracted, and with the writer's usual policy, if not positively adopted, at least proposed as subjects of legitimate doubt. And yet, when he comes to consider the story in question, even he discards the evidence on which it is grounded.

“It is not certain,” says he, “that he (Gregory) commanded the noble monuments of the ancient magnificence of Rome to be destroyed, in order to prevent the strangers, who visited the city, from bestowing more attention on the triumphal arches, &c., than on holy things. The same may be said with regard to the charge of having burned an immense number of Pagan books, particularly those of the historian Livy.”—Tom. ii. p. 1385. In a note he adds, “I have not met this except in Johannes Sarisberiensis, and therefore do not *give much credit to it*.”

Barbeyrac, too, although his language with regard to St. Gregory is most unmeasured, is forced into the same acknowledgment.

“I shall not advance here the charge which has been made against this Pontiff, of having burned, through a mistaken zeal, an immense number of Pagan works. *The accusation is not sufficiently substantiated.*”—*Morale des Pères*, c. xvii. p. 332.

Let us now then see how far Gibbon, with whom at least Mr. P. professes an acquaintance, bears out the charge which he so confidently puts forward.

“It is commonly believed that Pope Gregory I attacked the temples and mutilated the statues of the city; that, by the command of the barbarian, the Palatine library was reduced to ashes; and the history of Livy was the peculiar mark of his absurd and mischievous fanaticism. The writings of Gregory himself, reveal his implacable aversion to the monuments of classic genius; and he points his severest censure against the profane learning of a bishop, who taught the art of grammar, studied the Latin poets, and pronounced with the same voice the praises of Jupiter and those of Christ. But *the evidence of his destructive rage is doubtful and recent*. The temple of Peace, the theatre of Marcellus, *have been demolished by the slow operation of ages*, and a *formal proscription* would have *multiplied the copies* of Virgil and Livy, in the countries which were not subject to the Ecclesiastical dictator.”—Vol. v. p. 449.

He subjoins in a note,

“Bayle, in a very good article (Grégoire I), has quoted for the statues and buildings, *Platina in Gregorio I*; for the Palatine library, John of Salisbury; and for Livy, Antoninus of Florence. *The oldest of the three lived in the XIIth century.*”

What shall we say of the candour or good faith of one, who tells, without a syllable of doubt or hesitation, a story which he must have read in Gibbon, was a “vulgar belief,” resting on “recent and uncertain evidence,” the earliest author who relates it having “lived in the XIIth century,” *nearly six hundred years after St. Gregory?*

We cannot refrain from noticing, as we pass, one or two instances of that insincerity, with which the historian of the *Decline and Fall* has been so frequently taxed. In the passage already quoted, we are told that St. Gregory “points his severest censure against the profane learning of a bishop who studied the Latin poets.” There needs but a reference to the Pontiff’s own words* to show that the meaning has been grossly misrepre-

* This passage, which is taken from the 49th letter of the 9th book, we transcribe entire. “*Cum multa nobis bona de vestris studiis fuissent nuntiata, ita corde nata est letitia, ut ea quæ sibi paternitas vestra concedenda poposcerat, minime negare valeremus. Sed post hoc pervenit ad nos quod sine verecundia memorare non possumus fraternitatem tuam grammaticam quibusdam exponere; quam rem ita moleste suscepimus ac sumus vehementius aspernati, ut ea quæ prius dicta sunt, in gemitum et tristitiam verteremus; quia in uno se ore cum Jovis laudibus Christi laudes non capiunt, et quam grave nefandumque sit episcopo canere, quod nec laico religioso conveniat, ipse considera.*”

Let the case be brought home to ourselves. The first symptom which pointed to the decay of literature and eloquence at Rome, as in every other country, was the gradual introduction of a false and corrupt taste among those who still continued to cultivate them. The strong and dignified beauty of its early masters was disregarded—the degrading and demoralizing study of such writers as Martial and Catullus took

sented. In a truly paternal letter he complains that the bishop employs his time in teaching or explaining the principles of grammar. But he speaks not one word of condemnation on his private studies: and, we believe there are few who will not join in condemning the conduct of a bishop, who, in a barbarous and imperfectly converted district, should forget the important duties of his responsible office, and devote that time, which is the property of his flock, to the unepiscopal employment of teaching a grammar school. We are told again, in the note, that for the charge of having mutilated the buildings and statues, "Bayle quotes Platina in Gregorio I:" nothing could be more disingenuous. It is true that Bayle cites Platina in reference to the charge; but, in the very second line he speaks of him as expressly rejecting it. It appears absolutely impossible to mistake his meaning, for he gives the entire passage from Platina, which no one could misunderstand. The fact is that he alludes to the accusation *only for the purpose of refuting it*.*

We have no difficulty in saying that the testimony of such men, deriving additional weight from their well-known hostility to religion, may place the matter beyond dispute. Let us examine it, however, upon its own merits. St. Gregory lived at the close of the sixth century. The history of a pontificate so active could not possibly remain long unrecorded. Accordingly we have two early lives of the Saint, by the deacons John and

its place. Suppose a bishop under such circumstances to lend the sanction of his example to a study which, in the words of Gregory, "*nec laico religioso conveniat*." Suppose him further, in a country where all his efforts were scarce sufficient to keep alive the spirit of religion in the hearts of an ignorant and barbarous people, to devote his time to a pursuit under circumstances of a very questionable character, and at best incompatible with his really important duties, can it be doubted that the very men who are thus severe upon St. Gregory, would be the first to join in the general dissatisfaction?

There is an anecdote told of a celebrated Bishop, which we recommend to all those, whose life is a practical censure upon St. Gregory: his appointment to the see of Avranches did not at all abate the unwearied application to study for which he had always been remarkable. It frequently happened in consequence, that persons calling on business were dismissed on the plea that the bishop was engaged at his studies. The inconvenience, often repeated, at last provoked the simple but significant exclamation, "Would to heaven the king would send us a bishop who had finished his studies."

* "*Neque est cur patiamur hac in re a quibusdam potissimum litterarum ignavis carpi; quod suo mandato veterum ædificia sint directa, ne peregrini et advenæ (ut ipsi fingunt) ad urbem religionis causa venientes, posthabitis locis sacris, arcus triumphales et monumenta veterum cum admiratione inspicerent. Absit hæc calumnia a tanto Pontifice Romano præsertim cui patria certe post Deum, quam vita carior fuit. Multa profecto ex collapsis ædificiis exedit vetustas. Multa præterea demoliuntur homines ædificandi gratia ut quotidie cernimus. . . . Gregorius autem, confirmata omni ratione Ecclesia Dei, Anno xiii, mense sexto, die decimo, sui pontificatus moritur et sepelitur collachrymantibus omnibus in Basilica Petri, &c. —Plat in Greg. i: p. 54.*"

Paul. But neither do these biographers, nor any of the historians of that period, advert once to a fact, which, if true, must of its own nature have been notorious. Five centuries elapsed—still not a single trace of its existence. At length, near the close of the sixth century from the pontificate of Gregory, one writer is discovered; and upon this foundation the entire story is built. The writer in question is John of Salisbury,* in an exceedingly curious work, entitled *Policraticus sive de nugis curialium et vestigiis Philosophorum*. “But if the pursuits of mathematicians were praiseworthy, the great Augustin would not have regretted so much that he devoted himself to their consultations. Moreover, the most holy Doctor Gregory, who irrigated and inebriated the whole Church, with the honeyed stream of his eloquence, not only banished mathematics from his court, but, as it is *handed down from our forefathers*, condemned to the flames

“Scripta Palatinus quæcumque tenebat Apollo.”†

There is a second allusion to the story in the eighth book, “*Fertur bibliothecam combussisse gentilem;*”‡ and this is the sum of the evidence upon which it rests—the testimony of a single writer six centuries posterior to the fact—who has not confidence enough in the truth of his statement to give it upon his own authority, but deems it necessary to qualify the narrative by a *fertur, traditur a majoribus!* He is not even a regular historian; for then his professional research might have supplied him with means of information unattainable to others. If he occasionally introduces historical facts, it is but for the purpose of illustration; and, in this instance, it is abundantly evident, that the position which he wishes to establish, would lead him to press an obscure or doubtful tradition into his service.

Principle and practice are very different things; and it is often amusing to observe how little trouble is taken to reconcile them. A fact is attested by two or three, or even more contemporary writers; but it happens to clash with some favourite opinion. At once a thousand causes are shown, why the evidence should not be admitted—perhaps it is rejected without attempting to show cause at all. On the other hand, a single unsupported writer, at the distance of four or five centuries, relates a story which favours some long-cherished prejudice. He is dragged at

* John of Salisbury died in 1104. He was the contemporary and friend of St. Thomas of Canterbury. He accompanied him in his exile, and at his last hour, in the effort to shield him from the sacrilegious violence of his assassins, was himself dangerously wounded. His work was translated by the historian Mezeray under the title, *Vanités des Cours.*)

† Lib. ii. c. 26, p. 104.

‡ Lib. viii. c. 19, p. 557.

once from his obscurity, and rises to all the honours of unquestionable authority. This is precisely the case here. The very men who laugh at the idea of tradition, considered as a source from which divine truth may be derived, and fritter it away, even when regarded as a history of passing events, or a register of existing opinions, if among these writers whom they professedly disregard, they find one favourable to a particular view, at once adopt his authority; and, as if their credulity were all condensed into this single point, cling to it with a tenacity which no argument can shake. The extent of the absurdity, in this particular instance, is strongly put by Tiraboschi.*

“Were I to ask him (M. Brucker), ‘whether he believed the story of the liberation of Trajan’s soul from hell, at the intercession of St. Gregory?’ he would laugh at the question, and perhaps resent my boldness in proposing it. If I added, in confirmation, that it was related by a writer of the twelfth century, he would tell me that these ages were fertile in such fables; that it betrays no less ignorance than weakness and superstition in the narrator; and that there needs but little discernment to discover its absurdity. Such would be his reply, as it would be that of any judicious writer.

“Well; this very John of Salisbury, whom M. B. describes as ‘learned beyond his age,’ ‘a writer of the highest character throughout the Church,’ ‘a most distinguished member of the university of Paris,’ displaying the rarest critical acumen, &c. &c.—this very man, on whom such extravagant encomiums are heaped, in order to add weight to his narrative of the burning of the Palatine Library, recounts the legend of Trajan with the utmost gravity. These are his words: ‘Virtutes ejus legitur commendasse. S. P. Gregorius, et, fuis pro eo lachrymis, infervium compescuisse incendia.’ After relating the virtuous action by which Trajan merited this reward, he continues, ‘The Holy Pontiff is said to have wept until it was revealed that Trajan was released; but on condition that he should not again presume to intercede for an infidel.’ (lib. v. c. viii.) Does M. Brucker, then, believe the tale? And yet, on what principle does he refuse to believe? Let him only read over the long passage, in which he himself seeks to establish the writer’s credibility in reference to the burning of the Palatine Library, and he will find that all his arguments are equally forcible here. Here, too, it may be alleged, that ‘he refers to ancient documents, in which the fact was recorded,’ *legitur, fertur*; that ‘he abstains from giving his authority, because, in a matter so notorious, it was

* Lett. Ital. T. v. p. 179-82.

enough to hint at the common tradition, that, although he wrote in the face of the entire Church, and in the heart of the University of Paris, not one was found to question or deny the statement; and, therefore, all by their silence confirmed the narrative, as known to the whole world, and reflecting glory on the memory of the saint.' Notwithstanding all these cogent reasons, I have no doubt he will continue incredulous. He must acknowledge, therefore, that this author of his is not of such profound judgment as he would represent; that he relates matters which common sense pronounces impossible; that his *fertur, traditur, dicitur*, only indicate popular traditions, destitute of solid foundation; in one word, that he is not one in whom we can place unqualified confidence. Will any one say of an author who seriously relates the liberation of Trajan from hell, that we are bound to believe him implicitly, when, six centuries after the fact, without adducing a single proof, with a single *fertur, traditur a majoribus*, he tells us that the Palatine Library was burnt by order of St. Gregory? I put it to the common-sense of M. Brucker himself. He is too clear-sighted not to perceive, that, in this instance, he suffered himself to be carried away by the prejudices of his party, who have declared a bitter and implacable war against the memory of this Pontiff."*

Surely this is enough. The nature of the evidence on which the accusation is founded—the total absence of any conceivable motive for the act, which, as Gibbon justly observes, would have defeated its object by multiplying the copies—the silence of five centuries in reference to a fact so remarkable—the faltering and uncertain tone of the testimony—the distance of time and consequent obscurity of a tradition unsupported by documents—all conspire, we will not say to shake, but to destroy, its probability. And yet this is the charge which, without a single expression of disbelief or even of doubt, Mr. James Prendeville has the temerity or dishonesty to introduce in a place to which, as he himself avows, it was not by any means "pertinent"! Surely the lite-

* We have said above that the biographer of the saint makes no allusion to this fact, too remarkable to have escaped his notice. We may go farther. It is impossible to reconcile the picture which he has drawn of the court of Gregory, with the act itself, or the motive in which it is said to have originated.

"Tunc rerum sapientia Romæ sibi templum visibiliter quodammodo fabricavit, et septemPLICIBUS artibus veluti columnis, Apostolicæ sedis atrium fulciebat. Nullus pontifici famulantium barbarum quodlibet in sermone, vel habitu præferebat; sed togata, Quiritum more, seu trabeata Latinitas, secum Latium, in ipsa Latiali palatio, singulariter obtinebat. Refloruerant ibi diversarum artium studia; et qui vel sanctionia, vel prudentia forte carebat, suo ipsius judicio subsistendi coram Pontifice fiduciam non habebat."—Vita Gregorii a Johanne Diacono conscripta. Prefixed to the Benedict. Edit. of the Works of St. Gregory, tom. i. p. 24.

rary delinquency alleged against St. Gregory is innocent in comparison with the injustice of his accuser ! The laws of civilized war scarcely tolerate the barbarity which cuts off the spring by which the inhabitants of a beleaguered city are supplied—what shall we say of the treacherous malignity which poisons its waters, that they may more securely destroy the unsuspecting victim !

We have already declared that our object in this inquiry is not so much to explain the full extent of the evil, as to direct to it the attention of the public, so long and unaccountably withheld. It may be imagined that we have exaggerated its extent, and that our premises do not warrant the wide and sweeping conclusion we are disposed to draw. We should rejoice, though at the expense of our own logic, that the statement were either exaggerated or untrue. But, unfortunately, those who have examined will feel with us, that it is but too accurate.

For ourselves, when we turn to the school-books almost every where in use, we know not what feeling predominates in our mind—indignation at the petty bigotry which has corrupted them all—or astonishment at the apathy of a people in other matters so discerning. Surely we may, now at least, indulge a hope that it will not any longer be tolerated. We appeal to those who are most deeply interested—the parents and guardians throughout the kingdom. The advice of Quintilian with regard to a youth's pronunciation should not be forgotten, surely, when his principles are at stake,—“*Nedum infans quidem est sermoni qui dediscendus est assurecat.*”

The question, however, is more important in its religious than it could possibly be in its social relation. Misrepresentation, unfortunately, seems to be almost inseparable from difference of opinion. It is always unsafe to decide on the report of an adversary ; and in selecting a religious creed among the many which are offered for examination, the utmost caution must be used to ascertain without prejudice the distinctive doctrines of each. How, we repeat, can any one discuss fairly the truth of the Catholic religion, if he has been taught from his childhood to lisp of its “*foul idolatries*”?—if his youthful mind has been filled with horror of its superstitions, its intolerance and hostility to science?—if his fancy be fed in manhood with representations of the profligacy of prelates, the fraud and falsehood of priests, the besotted ignorance of the people?

We would, again and again, remind our Protestant fellow-countrymen how much more difficult all this must be in the exercise of their leading principle. For all a degree of examination is necessary : but for the Catholic, the process is comparatively simple—once convinced, either by argument, or by the

experience of his own incompetency to decide for himself, that he must follow some divinely-authorized guide in the regulation of his religious opinions, an easy comparison will determine what Church has the strongest claims on his obedience; and here all his anxiety ceases. Henceforward, "her people becomes his people," "her God is his God." He submits his faith to her guidance with all the confidence which the authority of God himself can communicate. But it is not so with the Protestant inquirer. Instead of confining his inquiry to the general question of authority, he is obliged to explore every single doctrine, to grapple with every separate difficulty. He must traverse the wide and trackless sea of conflicting opinions, which lies between the humble faith of the Catholic on the one hand, and the unyielding scepticism of the infidel on the other—traverse it without a pilot, unaided and alone—

Αὐτὸς ἔῶν ἐρέτης, αὐτόστολος, αὐτόματος νῆυς.

We chose the Catholic religion as an illustration of the difficulty, because no other has suffered so much from misrepresentation. Of the various sects into which Christianity is divided, some are too insignificant to provoke the hostility of their rivals; in others, the characteristic difference is too slight or too speculative to afford much room for animadversion; and in all there is one common bond by which they are held together—their common protest against Catholicity. But the Catholic Church has none of these claims to forbearance. In age and extent she is apart from all her rivals. The line of separation is broad and distinct, excluding all, without exception, who do not subscribe to her authority. Hence, at all times, and in all places, she has drawn upon herself the hostility and abuse of all sectarians, without any exception. What wonder, then, that her doctrines are misconceived, and her morality misrepresented? The very name of Catholic has been a bar to inquiry. Like the gloomy inscription of Dante's hell,—

"Per me si va nella citta dolente,"

it has frightened away the timid though perhaps sincere inquirer after truth; and thus the very license engendered by the principle of private judgment in religion, has been rendered one of the worst obstacles to the freedom of its exercise.

Enough, we are convinced, has been said to satisfy every unbiassed mind. We have written with some degree of warmth, because we feel strongly the evils of the present disgraceful system. We repeat once more our confidence, that it cannot be tolerated longer. We appeal against its continuance to the honesty and candour of the community—to the Catholic, because it is an insult to that religion with which his dearest hopes are

associated—to the Protestant, because it makes a mockery of the first principle of his creed—to all in common, because it is a violation of truth and justice—an outrage against that charity and peace which, as men and Christians, they are in common bound to cherish.

ART. IV.—1. *History of the Inductive Sciences from the earliest to the present times.* By the Rev. Wm. Whewell, M.A., &c. London. 1837.

2. (Drinkwater's) *Life of Galileo.* Lib. Useful Knowledge.

3. *History of Philosophy.* By the Rev. Baden Powell, M.A., F.R.S., Savilian Professor of Geometry in the University of Oxford. London. 1837.

THERE are few subjects on which more has been written, and less understood, than the story of Galileo, and his far-famed persecution. We allude not merely to those writers who have manifestly allowed their prejudices and strong religious antipathies to darken over this page of history. The remark applies in an almost equal degree to writers of every shade of liberality—even to Catholics. We are told, for instance, by an ecclesiastical historian writing on the spot (Bernini, *Historia delle Heresie*), that this celebrated man was imprisoned for five years! Others, according to the report of Montucla, have asserted that his eyes were put out. Montucla himself, that he was kept in prison for a year. So late as our own times, *Pontecoulant* in France will tell you, in a grand flourish, “that this great man upheld the rotation of the earth on its axis, even in the dungeons of the Inquisition; and, securing followers for his system by his example, became its martyr;” (*Traité Analytique, discours préliminaire*;) while at home, we have Sir David Brewster bearing testimony at one moment to Galileo’s “confinement for a year,” (see *Brewster’s Encyclopædia, Art. Astronomy*,) and the next, confessing that, in saying so, he has been led astray by the misstatements of “*many distinguished writers*” who had gone before him. Still, these are but errors of minor importance, which are fast disappearing before the increasing light of history. It is in their relation to the general questions of religion and science, and the mutual bearings of these one upon the other, that the misconceptions and misstatements of writers will be found to be most general, most stubborn, and of most importance.

A belief is sought to be induced that the persecution of Galileo is but one fact among many, indicative of the same temper; that

the spirit it betrays has ever been an habitual feeling in the Church, manifesting itself at one time in a more, at another in a less prominent degree; but ever regarding the doctrines and conclusions of science with an eye of jealousy and mistrust; that the quiescence of the earth, *in particular*, was once a *dogma of faith*; that it was precisely for his scientific inculcation of the opposite *truth*, that the distinguished man before us was prosecuted and persecuted; that the Inquisition condemned and proscribed the Copernican views; and that the Inquisition is an authority decisive with Catholics on doctrinal points, whose province it is to declare what is, and what is not, to be believed in the Church,—what is, and what is not, to be regarded as heresy.

Such are the persuasions invariably produced by the perusal of even the best writers on the subject in this country. Of these we have selected a few to place at the head of this article. Some appear to us bigotted, even to a disgusting degree; while others, though, we regret to say, not the greater in number, as a sort of relief, are exempt from this charge,—not, however, that the latter are wholly free from the errors we have noticed. There seems to be something in the education of an English Protestant that incapacitates him from looking at this and many other facts in history in their true point of view.* But we give them credit for being above the *vulgar* prejudices of their creed and country. They manifest, and we have pleasure in recording it, a disposition to state the truth as they find it, without fear or favour; and they try, so at least it appears to us, to divest themselves of every feeling that could give an undue bias to their judgment. Now, it is principally from men of this stamp,—men, who, like the historian of the *Inductive Sciences*, know how to place themselves on an eminence, that observations, such as we have mentioned, come upon us with an increase of weight which entitles them to notice; and therefore it is that we deem it a duty to take the earliest opportunity of disabusing the candid among our countrymen of misconceptions so erroneous in themselves, and so injurious to the character of our religion and its ministers. Let us not, however, be mistaken. We are not the apologists of the Inquisition,—our's is a far higher object. It is expressed in the words of Kepler, which might serve for our motto, "*Sanctum quidem officium : at nobis magis sancta veritas.*" It is to relieve religion from imputations under which it has no right to labour, and to place the blame, if blame there be, stating its nature and amount, at the doors of those, and those only, who have to account

* In this respect, it must be confessed, our countrymen lose by a comparison with their fellow-religionists on the continent, and particularly in Germany.

for it. It would indeed be a mistake, more to be regretted than any which the darkest calumnies have gathered round the subject, if we should appear to sanction for a moment the belief that we enter on a task, which many will think so unpromising, from any uncomfortable sense of the necessity that presses on us, as Catholics, of vindicating the persons or the tribunal concerned. Why should we be called on to answer for the misdeeds, real or imaginary, of that celebrated institution? What possible bond of interest can be assigned to connect us with its doings? All that we venerate as Catholics in our hierarchy, had its birth in the institution of Jesus Christ. Now, the Inquisition had its rise in the wars of the Albigenses,—that is, just 1300 years too late for *us* to feel any very vital interest in it. Far from being an essential part of our Christian system, it is, in its nature, local and accidental, depending for its existence upon the will of the princes that respectively adopted it, as a sort of half-ecclesiastical, half-civil police-establishment, for the punishment and prevention of every attempt to disturb the religious tranquillity of the people over whom they ruled. Its constitution is far from uniform, varying according to the wisdom or caprice of the politicians that adopted it. Superlatively cruel in Spain,—more mild and sparing of human life (despite whatever the ignorant or malevolent may say) in Rome,—adopted in a few countries,—it was rejected by the many. In short, any one of our readers may turn Catholic as soon as he pleases, with the predetermination of rating this tribunal at every convenient opportunity for his pastime; whatever might be thought of such person's taste, no one will call his orthodoxy, at least, in question. The truth is, some of the most vigorous attacks on its character and constitution have proceeded from the pens of Catholic writers,—witness Fleury and Bercastel, whose strong religious attachments admit of no doubt. The personal characters, then, of the seven cardinals who drew up the famous decree of 1683, and of the Pontiff in whose reign, and with whose sanction it issued, are alone concerned in the decision at which the public may either now or hereafter arrive; and so far as that may be supposed to possess any interest for us, the world is at liberty to think us interested,—but how slender and remote is the tie! That decree, we shall shew, does not pretend to be a dogmatic decree, decisive of any point of doctrine; but were the case even otherwise, it would prove no more than that those who were never gifted by Christ with inerrancy, have erred. It was not to seven cardinals that the Redeemer said, “Go, teach all nations,” and “behold I am with you all days, even unto the consummation of the world.” The Sovereign Pontiff did *not* appear in the issuing of the de-

cree; but even if he did, it would remain to be seen in what capacity he shewed himself, whether as temporal prince, presiding over the public order of the community submitted to his charge, or as Bishop of the *particular Church* and *See* of Rome;—the first among equals;—or, finally, as Supreme Head of the Church addressing himself to the nations of Christendom, commanding their wills “to captivate their understandings to the obedience of faith.” In the last instance alone would the decision take the form of a doctrinal decree, and even as such, until it should be strengthened by the acceptation of the great body of the hierarchy, it is the belief of a large section of divines, that it might be rejected without at least breaking the bond of Catholic unity. What, then, when not one particle of all this appears? Nay, we go a step farther, and we say it is *the unanimous doctrine of theologians, now and then*, that even the universal Church, could it be supposed capable of adopting such a decree, could not make it binding on the consciences of Catholics; and, for this reason, that it would pretend to declare a certain doctrine as philosophically false.* Now Christ did not promise to be with his Church teaching philosophy, but to be with it teaching “all things whatsoever I have commanded you.” Among which, assuredly, the conclusions of philosophy did not form any part; we have explained ourselves at this length, to show how very remote and slender is the tie of sympathy between us and the actors in this memorable transaction; how very far, indeed, the conclusion, be it what it may that shall be adopted, is from implicating any one point of either belief or practice to which, as Catholics, we are attached. It is of use, also, in showing how dishonest are the artifices of several writers, upon this and such like subjects, who, glad to detect any real or supposed flaw in the character or conduct of the dignitaries and chief pastors of the Church, contrive to make the whole responsible for the acts of a few, by constantly fastening such things on “*the Church of Rome*,”—thus screening their dishonesty under an ambiguous phrase, without having the candour to apprize their readers, that *the Church of Rome* may, at one time, signify the particular See of that city, and, at another, the universal Church in communion therewith. To illustrate what we have been saying, we shall not go beyond the late English biographer of Galileo, a gentleman for whose work we had a long time been in unsuccessful

* We accommodate ourselves for the moment to the ideas of those who suppose that the above was the decision of the Inquisition itself in 1633; whereas it was only that of the “*Qualifiers*”—subordinate officers of the Inquisition, and not of the Inquisitors themselves, who merely recite this with the other particulars of the proceeding of 1616, in *the preamble* of their judgment of 1633.

quest, by the name of *Drinkwater's Life of Galileo*, without being aware, that it was identical with the anonymous "*Life*" in the *Library of Useful Knowledge*,—a circumstance which we mention to account for our very tardy notice of the production. In this work, one confessedly of great ability, but we regret to be obliged to add, where Rome and its religion are concerned, not of equal candour, the biographer has, in the most disingenuous manner, misrepresented, and thereby sought to do away with the effect of, a very simple observation of the accomplished historian of Italian literature, Tiraboschi; who, in speaking of the condemnation of Galileo, had mentioned, that "this too rigorous censure had proceeded solely from the Inquisition of Rome, and that amongst the most zealous Catholics, not one had ever attributed to that tribunal the privileges of infallibility." This observation, Mr. Drinkwater* has the hardihood, with the original text staring him in the face in his own note, to describe as "an attempt to draw a somewhat subtle distinction between the Bulls of the Popes and the Inquisitorial decrees, sanctioned and approved by him," though there is not one word in the Italian's remarks concerning Bulls of the Popes. Mr. Drinkwater farther describes Tiraboschi as *regarding it as a special mark of grace, that the head of the Church was not permitted to compromise his infallible character, by formally condemning the opinions of Copernicus*, though, neither in this case, is there one word in the original regarding *the head of the Church, or his infallible character, or his condemning the opinions of Copernicus!*

Next, after misrepresenting, comes the task of disproving the statement of the Italian,—and how is this accomplished? By producing a Catholic zealous enough to claim infallibility for the Roman Inquisition? No,—but he finds in the musty volumes of some antiquated professor, a Bull of Sixtus V, establishing a *censorship of the press, under the title of the Congregation of the Index*, and directing, that after the members of the congregation shall have duly examined each work, and made their report thereon to the reigning Pontiff, they shall proceed by, and with his authority, to condemn the same. Who can now refuse to believe, that in the opinion of the said professor and *all good Catholics*, the Inquisition is infallible?—though, to find out what the Congregation of the Index has to do with the Inquisition, or either with infallibility, would puzzle any one but Mr. Drinkwater.

But this writer has another specimen of his own peculiar dialectics to bring up in aid of the last bright conclusion. It appears, the so-called Jesuit editors of Newton,—the same being

* Life of Galileo, (Lib. U. Knowledge), chap. xiii. versus finem.

Minims and not Jesuits, apologize in a short monitum prefixed to the third book of the "*Principia*," for having assumed the earth's motion. These are their concluding words, "We profess to pay the obequious reverence which is due to the decrees of the Supreme Pontiffs against the earth's motion;" therefore, (he leaves us to conclude), the said decrees are, in the sentiment of the good fathers, once more infallible.

Why, none of the Popes have ever claimed for themselves half the infallibility which Mr. Drinkwater lavishes on them;—not only all the decrees emanating from the Pope in person, even those, which he never dreamt of being looked at in that light,—nay, those which, like the decrees respecting the earth's motion, merely regulate external discipline, are infallible; but every subordinate functionary acting in the name, and by the authority of his Holiness, is immediately invested with the awful prerogative; and then, by favour of Mr. Drinkwater, instead of one Pope we shall have dozens; and as for decrees, we shall be blessed with some scores of these infallible missives, of which we never dreamt even in our most glorious visions,—how much obliged should we not be? *O nimium felices sua si, &c.* But to be serious, we cannot help thinking, that Mr. Drinkwater might easily have found some more creditable exercise for those talents which we cheerfully acknowledge him to possess, than in the ungracious attempt to deprive any portion of his fellow Christians of the benefit that might arise from their own exposition of their own principles, by vainly pretending to understand those principles better than those who profess them. 'That creatures with inferior powers, should try to supply the defect of natural ability, by pandering to the well-known religious antipathies of their readers, by misrepresentations of Catholic tenets, is what we can easily understand, and what we daily behold with silent commiseration; but that such as Mr. Drinkwater should stoop to the degrading practice, argues a depravity of taste,—to say no more, that must dim the lustre of the brightest talents. We should grieve to think that all his brethren were equally illiberal, but no, we have pleasure in being able to state, that there are, or at least have been, in the ranks of Protestantism, minds sufficiently enlarged and sufficiently candid to do us justice even on this point, though it is necessary to travel into Germany to find such a one. The celebrated *Christian Wolf*—a name that will continue to command respect, when that of Mr. Drinkwater shall be forgotten, has repeatedly, not only acknowledged, but urged in proof of the unbounded liberty of thinking on this subject, that there is nothing in the decrees or principles of our Church to hinder the most scrupulous Catholic from embracing whatever

side of the question may seem to him best.—*Vide Element. Astron. Pars ii. cap. iv. de Systemate Plan. Schol. v. et alibi pluries.*

But if even our biographer were to take the trouble to correctly inform himself of the truth of the facts he is pleased to record against us, we should not have so much cause to complain. “This coy reluctance” he facetiously proceeds in the next paragraph, “to admit what nobody doubts, *has survived to the present time*, for Bailli informs us that the utmost endeavours of Lalande, when at Rome, to obtain that Galileo’s work should be erased from the Index, were entirely ineffectual, in consequence of the decree which had been fulminated against him; and in fact both it, and the book of Copernicus, ‘*Nisi corrigatur*’ are still to be seen on the forbidden list of 1828.”

Now hear M. Lalande himself, speaking of this very Index, in his ‘*Voyage en Italie*,’ 12mo. Venice, 1769, tome 5, chap. iii. pp. 48, 49. “On est surpris de voir dans ce catalogue des livres tels que ceux de Copernic, de Boerhaave, qui nous paroissent bien éloignées de tout soupçon d’hérésie; mais il y a dans les hypothèses des Physiciens et des Astronomes des choses qui paroissent quelques fois dangereuses dans leurs conséquences éloignées, et cela suffit pour mettre un livre à l’Index; on a cependant consenti dans la dernière édition” (a little before he says *depuis quelques années*) “à supprimer l’article qui comprenoit *tous les livres où l’on soutient le mouvement de la terre*: ce système si bien démontré *actuellement* a enfin trouvé grace devant la Congrégation de l’Index; mais il a fallu de la part de savans bien de sollicitations et de démarches.” This work of Lalande’s is to be found in almost every library. At all events Mr. Drinkwater professes to have read Delambre; this writer could have informed him that Benedict XIV cancelled the decree in question, all infallible as Mr. Drinkwater describes it. Had he even looked into the several editions of Galileo’s works which he takes care to recount, he would have found in that of Padua of 1744, the “*Dialoghi che ora esce finalmente alla luce colle debite license.*” But it makes little matter if the misstatement which Mr. Drinkwater adopts and transmits—others again shall adopt and transmit from him in their turn. It is only the followers of the Church of Rome it can affect, and to avoid that who would be at the trouble of the slightest research?

We shall return to this writer; he is destined to afford us an occasional diversion “on the dull path we’ve yet to tread” of toilsome investigation; meanwhile it may be soothing to him to know, there is nothing more familiar in our history, both *before* and since the condemnation of Galileo, than that decisions of the

Inquisition should be rejected or reformed by the higher authorities in our Church. The Council of Trent itself has taught Catholics to place no implicit reliance on its awards and judgments; witness the case of Carranza. But to the immediate question before us. What has been the temper and feeling of the Church in reference to the Copernican views? What, in the words of a Professor of Oxford, Mr. Powell, (Lardner's Cyclopædia) *has been their reception by the Church?* If one were to abandon one's self to the impressions invariably produced, industriously or otherwise, by the various writers on the subject in this country, one should think that from the beginning the Church authorities regarded, as we have before observed, the growing opinions with an eye of jealousy and mistrust, and that finally in the days of Galileo this long pent-up jealousy broke out in open rupture, when the Church avowed itself the sworn antagonist of the Heliocentric doctrine; that doctrine which is now universally adopted even in her own schools, and of which, had it depended on her, mankind would have never heard. Now what will our good readers think when we inform them, that it is to this Church of Rome we are mainly indebted for the new theory of the earth's motion,—that in Rome it had its birth—in Rome was fostered and matured—that but for Roman auspices—the countenance of Popes and Cardinals—the adoption of the new theory had in all human probability been thrown back to a distance which it would be now to no purpose to try to calculate. Yes, to the Pontiffs and dignitaries of Rome we are mainly indebted for the Copernican system.

The first to broach that system in modern times was a Cardinal. Destitute and a stranger,—an ultramontane to,—indebted for his very name to the obscure village that gave him birth—Nicholas the Cusan yet had talent, and that was enough to open to him the road to the highest preferment in that Church and nation, which it is the fashion to decry as the enemy of all mental improvement:—but which has ever rewarded virtue and talent, unchecked by that undue regard to aristocratic pride and pretension, which forms so disadvantageous a contrast in the establishments of other lands. Well: how did this poor ultramontane recommend himself? Why he departed from the received opinions of the day,—he abandoned the doctrine of the schools,—he advanced in the teeth of the much exaggerated peripatetic dogmatism, the startling proposition, that "*the earth moves, the sun is at rest,*" and answered the objections from the senses as they have ever been answered, by contending that the illusory impression arises from the same cause which makes one in a ship in motion, fancy the objects on shore to be re-

ceding from him. Nor did he keep these views a secret,—he proclaimed them as best he could. He advanced them to the very steps of the Papal throne, by inscribing them to his former preceptor in Canon Law, the Cardinal Giuliano Cesarini. Subsequently rewarded with the Archdeaconry of Liego, he is found at the Council of Basil in 1431, side by side with the same Cardinal Giuliano, and presenting to that celebrated assembly a treatise on the disorders which had crept into the Calendar, and a proposal for its reformation; that is to say:—he takes up that position in the face of all Christendom, which makes every extraordinary expression of opinion on his part a matter of necessary notoriety and attention. Now what is the consequence?—persecution? Yes! if being raised to the highest dignity in the “Church of Rome,” be persecution. Nicholas the Fifth, that enlightened Pontiff, and patron of learning, creates him Cardinal, and bestows on him the bishopric of Brixen; while the most delicate affairs and important legations are entrusted by four successive Pontiffs to his wisdom and integrity. Such were the unequivocal marks of the esteem and affection with which the Court of Rome continued to honour this daring innovator, without one moment’s interruption, to the close of his valuable life in 1464.

Nor were the works of the good Cardinal allowed to go down with him into the oblivion of the tomb. It was one of the first tasks of the Italian press, to diffuse and perpetuate them under the sanction of another exalted Church name—that of Cardinal Amboise.

The seed fell upon a grateful soil. The men of the next generation took up the idea with ardour; so that the celebrated Leonardo da Vinci, who was a young man when Cusa died, connects, in 1510, his theory of the fall of bodies with the earth’s motion, as a thing already generally received; thereby shewing, as Mr. Whewell justly remarks, “that the Heliocentric doctrine and the truths of mechanics were fermenting in the minds of intelligent men, and gradually assuming clearness and strength, some time before they were publicly asserted.” We shall soon see that this public assertion came somewhat sooner than even Mr. Whewell appears to imagine. Vinci wrote in 1510; already, in 1500, Copernicus was in possession, by invitation, of a professor’s chair in the capital of Catholicism, and delivering lectures on his new theory to overwhelming crowds that flocked to hear him, frequently, says Jacquier, to the number of two thousand (*Insts. Phil.*) This in the very heart of papal Rome. Pretty good evidence of something more than “fermentation” previous to “public assertion.” But where did Copernicus find

this new doctrine, that seems to have won such favour in his own and his Roman auditors' eyes? "His discovery of his system," says Mr. Whewell, "must have occurred before 1507, for in 1543, he informs Pope Paulus III, in his dedication, that he had kept his book by him for four times the nine years recommended by Horace."* Tiraboschi thinks he derived it from his preceptor and friend, Novara; but Thomas Cornelio informs us,† that the prevalent opinion was, that the papers of Jerome of Tallavia, "who gave a good deal of thought to the subject," fell into Copernicus's hands, and were the immediate cause of engrossing all that great man's attention. Cornelio is borne out by the additional testimony of Barbieri‡,—Ginghene, or rather, Salfi, his continuator, thinks it certain; at all events, it was in popish Italy he found the idea which it was the labour and the glory of his life to work out into all its multiplied details.

It was certainly high time now for the "*spiritual tyrant*" to take the alarm, yet we find no symptom of such feeling, unless it is to be found in the Pope's having sought and obtained that great man's assistance in the reformation of the calendar. Upon his retiring from his duties as professor, which he did immediately after, the dignitaries of the Church are found vying with each other in honouring and rewarding that admirable man. They charge themselves with the care of providing for him an honourable and safe retreat; where, above the wants and distractions of life, he may devote the undivided energies of his great mind to the reconstruction of the whole fabric of astronomy.

Nor is he wholly lost sight of in the privacy of his learned retirement. From time to time, reports reach Rome of the progress of his labours: his coming work casts its shadow before. In 1518, we find Celio Calcagnini, the friend and companion of Cardinal Hyppolite D'Este, after journeying with his distinguished patron into Germany and the neighbouring countries, setting himself, upon his return, formally to prove "*Quod Cœlum stet, terra autem moveatur.*" What is the consequence? He is taken into favour by two successive Pontiffs, both eminent for their love and protection of science, Clement VII and Paul III; who, in token of their esteem, attach him to the papal court in quality of Proto-Notary Apostolic. Of these, the former, Clement, has left behind him a monument still to be seen in the Royal Library of Munich, of the pleasure which he received on another occasion, in 1533, exactly ten years before the appearance of the "*De Revolutionibus*," from the exposi-

* Whewell's History, vol. i. p. 377.

† Progym. de Universitate.

‡ Notizie istoriche.

tion of the forthcoming system by John Albert Widmanstadt, who had just arrived from Germany. It consists of a volume, in the fly-leaf of which it is mentioned, in the hand-writing of Widmanstadt himself, that the Pontiff had presented it to him in testimony of the gratification he derived from his exposition, delivered by his (the Pontiff's) command in the Vatican Gardens.* As an additional mark of approbation, Widmanstadt was made private secretary to his Holiness.

The second of these enlightened heads of the Catholic world, was one whom the united suffrages of Ariosto, Fracastoro, and Calcagnini, place in the very first rank of the Mæcenates of philosophy and letters. But the most unequivocal testimony of all is to be found in the fact, that Copernicus, from the remote banks of the Vistula, sought and found in Paul III a patron and protector for that system which was to displace the astronomical systems of all former times and of all countries. Long that philosopher hesitated ere he would commit his labour to the judgment of mankind. He knew the boldness of the enterprise, and how ill the world was prepared for the reception of doctrines so new and so startling. He saw that there was but one spot in the universe where he could hope to find minds sufficiently enlarged and enlightened, to give him a favourable hearing. He appealed to Rome, *and especially as against the scriptural attacks of the timid and scrupulous religionist.* And the successor of St. Peter flung over the infant theory, the shield of his high protection, and secured it a period of eighty years' tranquillity and peace; a period amply sufficient to allow it to strike deep root into the minds of the astronomical world, and obtain for it every just and impartial consideration. But this was not all. Rome did not even wait till its protection was solicited. In the first year (1536) of this Pope's pontificate, it becomes known there that Copernicus is prevented from producing his great work, both by the consideration just mentioned, and by the want of means. Instantly, Cardinal Scomberg (Nicholas), with a generosity that cannot be too highly appreciated, stepped forward, and in the most earnest manner solicited the discoverer no longer to withhold his work from the public; and, in order to remove every objection as to the inadequacy of means, charged himself with all the necessary expenses. Unfortunately, he too soon dies; but another Church dignitary is found to replace him, and, under the encouragement and by the assistance of the Bishop of Eremeland (Gisio), the work is brought to a successful issue, and comes forth to the light bearing on its front the name and the sanction of the head of the Catholic world.

* Marini, Archiatrii Pontificii, Salsi.

Let the revilers of the Church of Rome put their finger on any one service commensurate with this, which any one, or all of their Churches together, have ever rendered to science; and then, perhaps, we may listen with patience to their bigoted and one-sided drivellings on the subject of Galileo.

We have said that the protection thus extended to the Copernican System, secured to it a period of nearly eighty years' uninterrupted tranquillity. To this, if we are to believe a writer in *Lardner's Cyclopædia*, Mr. Powell of Oxford, there is one memorable exception in the person of the unfortunate Giordano Bruno. "He attacked the scholastic doctrines with unsparing boldness, and exposed their absurdities to the most deserved ridicule. He was, OF COURSE, soon brought under the power of the Inquisition, condemned as a heretic, and ultimately burnt at Rome in 1600."—*History of the Physical and Natural Sciences*, p. 159.

Now, either Mr. Powell believed what he here writes, or he did not. If he did, he is a very incompetent historian, and if he did not, he is a very dishonest one. He ought to have read Montucla, who would have instructed him; and if he did not read Montucla, he was very presumptuous in offering himself as the historian of the sciences. Let Cambridge, however, correct Oxford. "The heresies," says Mr. Whewell, "which led to his unhappy fate, were *not*, however, his astronomical opinions, but a work which he published in England and dedicated to Sir Philip Sydney, under the title of *Spaccio della Bestia Trionfante*, and which is understood to contain a bitter satire of the Catholic religion and the Papal government. Montucla conceives that, by his rashness in visiting Italy after putting forth such a work, he compelled the government to act against him." So far Mr. Whewell, *History*, vol. i. p. 384. We have something to add. It so happens, that this idol of the Oxonian professor's worship, was about as vile a compound as ever graced the annals of criminal justice. He was not only a traitor to his prince, and a rebel against the authority to which, as a priest, he vowed at the altar reverence and obedience;—he was a renegade from every sect that admitted him into its bosom,—a violator of the peace of every civil community that gave him shelter. He sinned equally against God and man, not only denying transubstantiation, which may be a merit, and the virginity of the mother of God, which may be a *peccadillo*, with the Oxford professor; but so notoriously impious, that in Wirtemberg, it has been asserted and believed, that he pronounced the panegyric of the devil. There, he himself tells us, he earned the public execration, though there he turned Lutheran, after having been a Calvinist in Geneva.

In this last-mentioned capital of dissent and loose belief, even the followers of John Calvin could not tolerate him, despite his merit as an apostate. In Paris he contrived to get himself so hated, that he was obliged to fly that city in like manner. Wherever he went he was found vomiting forth the foulest effusions of splenetic malice against the venerable head of his nation, and the ancient Church he abandoned, calling the sovereign Pontiff by the style and title of the "Roman Wolf," from whose furious and rabid voracity he had narrowly escaped. It was by indecencies like these he dishonoured the obsequies of the Duke of Brunswick, whose funeral-oration he was invited to pronounce in 1589. The good people of Helmstadt refused to suffer the miscreant's stay so long as would be requisite for him to superintend the printing of the last page of his work, *De Triplici Minimo*. But Rome, it seems, had the daring to vindicate its insulted majesty, and to avenge the crimes of this universal outcast; and immediately all the delinquencies of the culprit disappear, and his memory is embalmed in the veneration of the Oxford professor. No doubt the public may shortly expect, as a pendant to the "*reception of the new discoveries by the Church*," the edifying life and martyrdom of Giordano Bruno—the last accession to Mr. Powell's calendar of saints, with edifying extracts from the *Candelaio*, in refutation of Scipio Maffei's impious denunciation of that work as "*infamous and wicked*." * Another saint and bright philosopher of Mr. Powell's, is the double renegade, Antonio de Dominis. He actually—would you believe it, reader?—calls in the recreancy of the man in matters of faith, to eke out his merits as a philosopher. These have been very justly denied by more than one distinguished writer: But he, too, incurred the displeasure of the ancient Church, and that is

* Mr. Drinkwater, too, has a paragraph (p. 8) on Bruno. It is difficult to speak of it as it deserves, and yet keep within those bounds which it is always painful to be obliged to overstep. In the description given above—strong as it may appear—of that bad man Bruno's conduct and doctrines, it has not been even attempted to convey any thing like an adequate idea of the revolting reality. Indeed, we could not think of polluting our pages with the wretch's horrid blasphemies—blasphemies so impious as to appear to have shocked even the impious Toland. Let the reader who would know more about them, consult Bayle and Chaussepied; and while he remembers that these writers are not remarkable for friendliness to Rome, we leave it to him to give, if he can, its proper name to that which could so far lead astray the mind and heart of a biographer of Galileo, as to make him step aside from his subject, in order to dig up so foul a memory from the heap of infamy under which it lay festering for centuries, and bespeaking for the vile object the sympathy of his simple readers, by arraying him in the attributes of an injured man, try to fling all the odium that hitherto attached to the culprit on the judges who condemned him; and condemned him, too, in accordance with the verdict long pronounced by indignant Europe, with an unanimity which, amid the jars and dissensions of that discordant period, is not its least striking circumstance.

sufficient not only to cancel, in our historian's eyes, the abandonment of two religions, but to erect him into an inductive genius of the truest stamp. Our readers will hardly, after this, expect us to bestow any farther attention on Mr. Powell.*

There is no need to travel out of the personal history of Galileo himself for evidence to shew that this disposition in reference to science, of which we have seen such pleasing manifestations, had continued to subsist to his own time; since he has left the record of his sense of its influence in his own case in terms too energetic to be readily forgotten. No sooner had he directed the telescope to the heavens, and made those discoveries that have been the memorable consequence, than he determined to repair to Rome, as to the spot, of all Europe, where, with the best prospect of advantage to science, he could first make known those startling revelations which it now became his exalted privilege to proclaim to the astonishment of mankind. So fully impressed does he seem to have been with the value and importance of this step, that not all the remonstrances of the court in whose service he had been about to engage, could induce him to so much as postpone his visit, observing, somewhat sharply, in his reply to the representations of Secretary Vinta, "that, if he, as professor of astronomy, shewed himself rather anxious about going to Rome, he ought, in consideration of the truths he shall there have to announce, and their bearing on astronomy, by the changes and additions they will necessitate, not only to be excused, but seconded, in (thus) making palpable and plain the things that, by God's help, he had discovered." The result justified these cheering anticipations. His reception was as though one of his own starry wonders had dropt from the sky. Gardens and palaces are flung open for his use, and prelates and cardinals are his admiring attendants. Even Bellarmine, who had recently reaped the highest honours in another and a remote field of intellectual labour, and who, with his Jesuits, has been accused of having directed the censures of the Church against the Florentine professor, partook of the general interest, and wrote to the Astronomical School of his own order in the Roman College, to ascertain if the facts were as alleged;—he is answered that they are, and that there is no questioning them. Nor was this answer given without a full knowledge of the consequences to science

* This gentleman's classical attainments seem to be on a par with his historical: See his translation of Pliny's Encomium on Hipparchus, as one "*ausus rem etiam Deo improbam, annumerare posteris stellas,*" thus *turned out of* Latin by Mr. P.:—"who ventured to do a thing *wrong in the sight of the Deity!*" &c.—*Powell*, p. 58. Oh! "Columns, Gods, and Men!" who ever before heard of praising a man for doing a thing wrong in the sight of the Deity?

which it involved; for we soon after find the most venerable of these reverend respondents—the celebrated Padre Clavius—in repeating, on another occasion, the same assurance, adding these remarkable words: “which things being so, let astronomers now look to it, and see how the heavenly orbs are to be constituted, so as to save these phenomena.”*

Far different was the reception that awaited him in his own native Tuscany. There had he scarcely arrived, when an intimation followed him from Rome, warning him of the machinations of some of his own townsmen, and, more painful still, some of his own pupils. Machinations which are said, we know not with what truth, to have given rise to those indecent exhibitions of intemperate zeal, in which more than one Tuscan ecclesiastic of the time indulged from the pulpit, against the sacrilege of sending this world spinning in wide space round the sun. Conduct like this, ill-calculated as it was to conciliate respect in any quarter, certainly found no sympathy in Rome. On the contrary, every one has heard of the severity which it drew down from the general of the Dominicans on one of his subordinates—the friar Caccini—and the universality with which his sentiments were shared, is thus attested by Castelli. “I have not spoken,” says that eminent ecclesiastic and philosopher, writing from Rome, “to one who does not deem it great impertinence in preachers to mount their pulpits to treat of such high professor-like matters (*matterie di cattedra, e tanto elevate*) before women and a people, where there are so few to understand them.”

Still Galileo shewed himself foremost to raise and debate the mischievous and uncalled-for question of the reconciliability of the Scripture-texts with the new theory; for, so early as 1612, emboldened, it is probable, by the very flattering reception he had lately received in Rome, he directed a letter, the reply to which we shall give in its appropriate place, to one of the highest functionaries there, by way of inquiry on the subject. To this course, which he clung to throughout with desperate tenacity, he seems to have been determined by the double persuasion, now recognized to have been absolutely false, that the system *was demonstrated*, and that to *him* belonged the honour of having furnished the demonstration from the flux and reflux of the tides. On this double assumption it may not be amiss, before we proceed farther, to make one or two passing observations. “*Carnous ne devons pas,*” says Bailly, “*juger de cette faute par les lumières de notre siècle.*” “Researches then” (we quote the

* Commentary on the Sphere of Sacrobosco, as cited by Scheiner in his *Disqui. Mathematicæ*.

words of Delambre reviewing his own labours) “prosecuted with the most scrupulous exactness, have failed to bring to light any other astronomy but that of the Greeks. The only things to be met with, from the most remote antiquity to the epoch of Copernicus, are the ideas of Hipparchus and Ptolemy. Arabians, Persians, Tartars, Indians, Chinese, Europeans,—it is all one. Every where, and at all times,—the earth motionless in the centre of the planetary movements. All appearances were sufficiently accounted for. All observed phenomena were calculated in this system by the aid of certain hypotheses, without any prominent error in the results occurring to inspire the slightest mistrust in the correctness of the fundamental idea.” To this universal acquiescence in the immobility of the earth, even the Pythagorean doctrine, this writer observes, formed no exception; not only because confined to the school in which it had its birth, but also because it owed its origin, not to any reasoned or consistent view, but to the spirit of disputation that prevailed in the ancient schools, and which infallibly caused that whatever opinion was held in any one, its opposite, for that sole reason, should be maintained in the next. Thus the Copernican idea, though broached in the ancient schools, was broached only to be rejected. So that, when taken up in modern times, it was, says this writer, “*a paradox*.” And such, says Mr. Whewell, it appeared in the hands of Cardinal Cusa, though it was undoubted, that that illustrious writer was serious in proposing it. The idea, then, was new—unheard of; opposed to all preconceived notions on the subject; opposed to the senses; opposed to the obvious and literal meaning of the divine word, and to its popular interpretation;—in a word, paradoxical, and one for which, says Delambre, the author had to draw wholly on his own resources. “And *what solid reason*,” M. Delambre goes on to ask, “could induce the ancients to disbelieve the evidences of their senses? *Yes, and even despite the immense progress which astronomy has subsequently made, have the moderns themselves been able to allege any one direct proof of the diurnal motion of the earth, previous to the voyage of Richer to Cayenne, where he was obliged to shorten his pendulum? Have they been able to discover one positive demonstration to the point, to prove the annual revolution of the earth, before Roemer measured the velocity of light, and Bradley had observed and calculated the phenomena of the aberration? Previous to these discoveries, and to that of universal gravitation (made many a long year after Galileo had ceased to breathe), were not the most decided Copernicans reduced to mere probabilities,—were they not obliged to confine themselves to preaching up the simplicity of the Copernican*

*system, as compared with the absurd complexity of that of Ptolemy?"** So far then for the first assumption of Galileo, that the system was demonstrated.†

Next, as to the grounds of his confidence in the new views; most modern writers assume, that it was inspired by the light which the first telescopic glimpse of the heavens let in on our system, particularly by the discoveries of the phases of Venus, and the satellites of Jupiter; now, nothing can be more mistaken.

Already, in the year 1597, THIRTEEN years before the discovery of the planetary phenomena revealed by the telescope, Galileo, in two letters, one of them to Kepler, declares his *long settled conviction* of this, his favourite doctrine. Writing at the end of his life, to his disciple Renieri,—he avows he was led to this opinion by the facility which he conceived it afforded him of explaining the mystery of the flux and reflux of the tides. This, to him, was the crowning proof, beyond which evidence could not go; beside it, the phases of Venus, and all the other wonders of 1610, were as nothing. When in 1616, he stood before the Inquisition, he alleged this grand demonstration in a letter to Cardinal Orsini;—subsequently, he transmits it to the Archduke Leopold, a tribute, in his mind, worthy a prince;—in 1623, he puts it forward once more in his letter to Ingolfi, in the same confident style; and devotes in his celebrated "*Dialoghi*," the whole of the fourth or last day's dialogue to the developement of this argument, that it may crown the climax of conviction, and concludes by scoffing at the simplicity of Kepler, particularly when after his, (Galileo's) satisfactory explanation of the phenomena,—he lends his ear and assent to such occult properties as the moon's influence on the tides "and other like puerilities." Lastly, when questioned before the Inquisition in 1633, he confesses, that this argument in particular "ENTERS with an extraordinary force and vigour into men's ears." No wonder that, as Bailli says, "*la foule d'astronomes était contre!*" Having thus persuaded himself that he had demonstrated the earth's motion, his next step was to prepare vigorously to remove the only

* Astron. Mod. Discours Prel.

† Nothing can be more disgusting than the flippancy with which half-informed writers (and they are always the most dogmatic) set, with the aid of a few verses from Milton, this assumed simplicity in boastful contrast with the cycles and epicycles of the Ptolemaic astronomy: as though this simplicity were not at best a very fallacious test of truth; or the Copernican system, as it came from the hands of its author, were not encumbered with a large share of the epicyclical machinery,—from which it was relieved, not by Galileo, who did nothing for the system in a mathematical point of view, but by the truly great and important discoveries of Kepler; or as though the Hipparchian method were not found of singular utility even by Newton,—or its principle did not constitute one of the most important and, for astronomy, most indispensable branches of modern science.

remaining impediment as he conceived in the way of its universal adoption, namely, the scriptural difficulties ; and, for this purpose, addressed so early as 1612, the letter to Cardinal Conti, to which we have before alluded, by way of enquiry on this subject. The cardinal's reply bears date July 12, and proves to us at least, that the new theory was not then considered "heresy" at Rome. After stating that the texts which assert that *the earth stands*, would admit of being so construed as to mean merely its stability or permanence, the cardinal proceeds,—“but when it is said that the sun goes round, and the heavens move, the only interpretation that can be proposed (by the advocates of the new views) is, that they speak after the common manner of the people, which mode of explaining cannot be admitted without great necessity ; nevertheless, *Diego à Stunica** says, the earth's motion is more in conformity with the Scripture ; his interpretation, however, is not followed.”

In pursuance of his unwise purpose of raising the question, as to the value of Scriptural objections against his system, Galileo seizes the opportunity afforded by a letter from Castelli, wherein is reported a conversation on the subject held at the table of the Grand Duchess of Pisa, to enter on that series of theological epistles which formed the sole ground of the impeachment against him which followed in 1615.

Lorini, a Dominican of Tuscany, and associate of Caccini, contrived by some means to get hold of a copy of the first of these letters—the one to Castelli ; and armed with the document, proceeded to Rome to lay his complaint before the Holy Office. The Inquisition, however, demanded *in limine* the production of the original ;—it was not forthcoming—proceedings were stayed, and the purpose of the denunciator was defeated. The correspondence of the leading characters on the occasion, which has come down to us, and which we now proceed to lay before our readers, reveals the whole temper of the tribunal in question, and the light in which they were disposed to look at the affair.

The denunciation took place towards the close of February 1615 : near a year before that, we have a letter from Monsignor

* “C'est un Théologien Espagnol,” says the learned Simon, speaking of Stunica in one of his letters, “d'un grand mérite, et qui parle de la sorte dans un pays d'Inquisition, et dans un ouvrage applaudi avec éloge.”

As a farther proof that there was no idea at the time of looking at the new doctrines as heretical, we will add, that when in 1613, Galileo's friend and favourite pupil Castelli was receiving his instructions on being appointed to the mathematical chair at Pisa, the Proveditore (Provost) of that university, Monsignor Reverendissimo Arturo d'Elci, in 1613, he was expressly allowed to take every opportunity of teaching his opinion as *probable*, provided only he did not put it forward from his chair as the *declared* opinion of the school.—Surely we need not ask how probable if heretical ? or how give permission to instil a heresy into the minds of a rising generation ?

Dini, the Bishop of Fermo, to Galileo, stating, that Cardinal Barbarini, afterwards Pope Urban VIII, under whom Galileo was finally condemned, told him, "how he (Galileo) should comport himself—to speak with circumspection, and as a mathematician," and that he, the cardinal, "*never heard a word, either in his own or in Bellarmine's congregation, of quei interessi of Galileo's, although, in either, the first mention of such things is made.*"

Immediately after the denunciation, viz. on the last day of February 1615, Ciampoli, the friend of the accused, and subsequently secretary to Pope Urban VIII, writes to say, that Barberini repeated to him the same sentiments, to wit, that "Galileo should not travel out of the limits of physics and mathematics, but confine himself to such reasonings as Ptolemy and Copernicus used, because—declaring the views of Scripture—the theologians maintain to be their particular province."

On the 21st of the next month (March) while the proceedings against Galileo were at their height, the same writer again addressed his friend:—"I have been this morning together with Monsignor Dini to the Cardinal Del Monte, who told us he had lately had a long conversation with *Cardinal Bellarmine on the subject of the new opinions, and that the conclusion was, that by confining himself to the system AND ITS DEMONSTRATION*, without interfering with the Scriptures, the interpretation of which they wish to have confined to theological professors, approved and authorized for the purpose, Galileo would be secure against any contradiction, but that otherwise explications of Scripture, however ingenious, will be admitted with difficulty when they depart from the common opinion of the fathers."* On the 15th of next month (April 1615) Bishop Dini, in a letter to his friend, testifies to "Bellarmine's having *remarked* to him (Dini) that there was no question about Galileo, (the case had been by this time dismissed), and that by pursuing the course mentioned, that of speaking as a mathematician, he would be put to no trouble."†

Thus terminated in a few weeks the first judicial enquiry into the doctrine of Galileo, which Mr. Drinkwater and others seem to confound with the second, which took place in 1616, at Galileo's own instance, and with which, as we learn from his, (Galileo's) own correspondence, Lorini had nothing to do. The denunciation then by this friar was a failure;—the original letter on which it was grounded, and without which the Inquisition refused to proceed, having been suppressed by Castelli; yet Cas-

* Lib. Nelli. quoted by Venturi.

† Ibid.

telli was never so much as reprimanded for the suppression, but remained in as great favour at Rome as ever; neither was he, or others who saw the original, examined as to whether the copy put in by the accuser was authentic. Had that obvious course been pursued, he dared not have withheld the truth,—but there was no disposition to urge matters to this length. The accused was not so much as cited, or otherwise in the least molested, and the whole affair was dismissed in a very few weeks. Certainly as yet, there is no evidence of a disposition on the part of Rome to quarrel with science, the only quarrel being that of Galileo with the theology of some of his countrymen. So little indeed do the authorities at Rome appear to have wished for any angry collision with the new doctrines, that at the very moment when they are accused of trying to crush these doctrines by the means of the Inquisition, that is to say, on the 7th of March 1615, Prince Cesi writes to his friend in Florence to tell him, that the preceptor of Popes, the talented Jesuit Torquato de Cuppis is delivering lectures in the Roman College (Bellarmine's own,) in support of the same Copernican doctrine,—while in the Pope's own University (Sapienza,) another Jesuit, as Nelli testifies, is delivering similar lectures; and yet Bellarmine and the Jesuits have been accused of the most bigotted hostility to the Copernican system of Astronomy. We may here observe, that Padre Grassi,* the Jesuit who wrote the "*Astronomical Balance*," and who is charged with having, out of pique, urged on the measures of hostility against Galileo in 1633, explains, in 1624, some time after Bellarmine's decease, what that Cardinal's views were. These are the words: "When a demonstration shall be found to establish the earth's motion, it will be proper to interpret the sacred Scriptures otherwise than they have hitherto been in these passages where mention is made of the stability of the earth, and movement of the heavens; *and this ex sententiâ Bellarmini.*"† To resume; Monsignor Dini, a correspondent who seems to have enjoyed the privilege of the freest intercourse with the Cardinals, and who took the liveliest interest in every thing that concerned his friend Galileo, says in a letter of the same 7th of March 1615: "Bellarmine has not spoken, that I could hear, of the prohibition of Copernicus's works, but possibly there will be appended to that work a *postilla*, to say, that it was

* "Grassi himself was not averse to the Copernican notions."—Targioni, *Scienze in Toscana*, vol. i.

† Letters of Guiducci, 6th and 13th September, 1624, Venturi and Nelli. Bartoli, another contemporary of the Cardinal's, his brother in religion, and biographer, asserts that documents in the handwriting of Bellarmine remained in his possession, which showed that the Cardinal never questioned THE TRUTH of Galileo's doctrine, but only the prudence of his manner of propounding it; but those we have cited above are more than sufficient.

written to save the phenomena, *and furthermore that people must not run on blindly and condemn either of these opinions.*" What after all this shall we say to an attempt* on the part of Mr. Drinkwater, to disguise the plain but material fact of the dogmatical nature of the course pursued and disapproved of? That gentleman expressly undertakes to controvert a position taken by M. Bergier, "*that Galileo was persecuted,*" (we would say *prosecuted*—the persecution part of the story having been long since given up,) "*not for having been a good Astronomer, but a bad Theologian,*" and how does he go about it? why he gives *a portion of a part* of the letter, that did *not* form the groundwork of the prosecution against Galileo, the letter to Madame Christina. Yet even this, too, is one tissue of theology from beginning to end, and so described by its own author, as is its precursor, that to Castelli: in fact, we do not know one well-informed writer who has made this attempt before Mr. Drinkwater. Nelli, Montucla, Delambre,—and so late as our own time, Biot† speaks of the letter to Madame Christina, (the very one from which Mr. Drinkwater quotes, and which is in substance the same as that to Castelli,) as one "*in which Galileo undertook to prove theologically, and by reasons drawn from the Fathers, that the terms of Scripture might be reconciled with his new doctrines on the constitution of the universe.*"‡

It is then undeniable, that at the period we are now considering, the authorities at Rome had no wish to pass a sweeping censure on the doctrine in question, but only to restrain its assertion within bounds, recognized by philosophy itself, and prevent its supporters from wounding unnecessarily the religious prejudices of those who, in the absence of demonstration, refused it their assent. In one word "*men must not run on blindly, and condemn either of these opinions.*" On this principle the Inquisition acted; allowing the system to take its stand among its rivals, that is, they set it down for all it was worth—a plausible, but as yet unproven opinion,—the truth or falsehood of which had still to appear.

The equitable and temperate decision thus come to, appears to have given general satisfaction to the advocates of the new opinions: Padre Griembergero's associate mathematician, and

* See "Life of Galileo," chap. xi.

† Biot's Life of Galileo, Biographie Universelle.

‡ Another assertion of Mr. Drinkwater, (Ibid.) is that "Galileo did not enter on this discussion till driven to it by a most indecent attack from the pulpit by a Dominican friar, (Caccini)." Even admitting this to be the fact, who does not see that the more than ample apology of the General Maraffi, struck from under the Tuscan's feet every ground of justification for entering on his improper course? but the slightest inspection of dates totally disproves the statement. The letter to Castelli was written *before any attack*.

brother Jesuit, in particular, congratulates Galileo, through Monsignor Dini, on the 25th April 1615, "*that his affairs are settled*, for that now there will be no difficulty in writing on the Copernican system, as mathematician and by way of hypothesis." Galileo, however, was not to be so easily pleased; he set his heart on having his adopted theory received as an unquestioned and unquestionable truth; nor could he rest easy till that object should be accomplished.

The whole history of his life is the illustration of this truth. Accordingly his first attempt is to get the new system declared by the Inquisition to be conformable with the Scriptures. This, and his dissatisfaction, are both revealed by the following letter, written three days after the preceding, by his indefatigable friend the Bishop of Fermo. "We may be quite sure," says the prelate, trying to quiet the philosopher, "that there is no question of the opinion, but among four or five not very friendly to you; and none of these have spoken to the Master of the Sacred Palace, but to a certain friend of his: all which is confirmed by the word of Grazia himself: and therefore it is perhaps as well *not to raise the question*, lest by assuming the attitude of defence, where no attack is made, you may excite the suspicion of something wrong; and such too is Cesi's opinion."*

Thus we see that the Florentine sage was bent on forcing this matter on again himself. In fact, he wrote, on the 23rd of the preceding month, an argumentative epistle to Dini, expressly that it might be submitted to the perusal "*of Bellarmine and the Jesuits, as being those who know most about such things.*"

"It appears to Prince Cesi," writes *his friend*, in reply to the perhaps repeated wish that this letter should be presented, "that I † should not present your letter to *THAT personage*, because he and many others in authority being decided Peripatetics (*pretti Peripatetici*), ‡ it is doubted he might be irritated on *a point already gained; which is, that you can write as a mathematician, and by way of hypothesis*; as they will have it Copernicus did: and this, though not conceded by his followers, is *nevertheless sufficient that others should obtain the same result; that*

* Letter of the 28th April, in Venturi.

† From this it appears that Nelli has fallen into one of his many mistakes, when he says that Dini caused several copies of this letter of the 23rd of March to be taken, especially, among others, for Bellarmine (*Nelli, Vita*, vol. i. p. 400, *Losanna*, 1793).

‡ In thus designating Bellarmine as a *prezzo Peripatetico*, we do not know if Dini can be borne out. The Cardinal was the particular friend of Prince Cesi, the celebrated founder of the Lincean Academy, who, both by the erection of this association, and his own scientific labours, did so much to pull down the Peripatetic philosophy. When that prelate was no more, Cesi himself testified to his having had particular pleasure in his (Cesi's) breaking the solid spheres, with which the Aristotelians had for ages encumbered the heavens. Not very like a "*Prezzo Peripatetico*."

of being left at liberty, provided only, as has been said, people do not invade the sanctuary. (Purche non s'intrè in Sagrestia, come sie detto altre volte.)”*

This very significant hint, that his best friends could not follow him with their approbation in the intemperate and uncalled-for course he was now meditating, was unfortunately lost on the sage. He proceeds with the elaboration of the last and most formidable of his polemical epistles; and having completed it, and sent it to the court of Florence, thereby “stamping it,” says a modern writer, “with the impress of royal authority,” he proceeds, towards the end of the year, with this armoury of theological weapons in his head, to storm the citadel of orthodoxy, the papal Inquisition; otherwise, in his own words, to learn “what he should believe on the Copernican System,” (letter to Renieri); and thus *uncited, and of his own free motion*, does he place himself—*personally* for the first time—his opinions for the second time—before the Inquisition, in opposition to the remonstrance of his friends: for it is idle in Mr. Drinkwater to try to lend plausibility to the prattle recorded in a gossiping letter of the day (it is to the letter of Querenghi we suppose him to allude, when he speaks of Galileo’s cotemporary), to the effect that Galileo was *cited*, on this occasion, to appear before the Inquisition.

Was it, we would ask Mr. Drinkwater, according to the rules of sound criticism and equity, thus to entertain this charge, when he must have had before his eyes at the moment, the fullest disproof of any such citation, in the correspondence both of the philosopher himself and his patron the Grand Duke? The latter, in his recommendatory letter which he gave his mathematician for a Cardinal, (who must have been in the secret, if any there had been, and whom it would be therefore folly to try to deceive) asserts that Galileo is proceeding to Rome, “*of his own accord*” (spontaneamente).† While he himself, in a letter to his court, dated from Rome, says, “I every day perceive more and more, *how happy an inspiration* and excellent a resolution was mine in determining to come hither, whence, I thank God, *and the kindness of their Serene Highnesses, who have granted me the necessary permission, &c.*” In that letter, he alludes to the various and disgusting artifices to which his untiring enemies had recourse, in order to vilify and injure him in the estimation of the great world in the Eternal City; no longer by legal prosecution—in that they had failed—but by private malice and whisperings, which, however, his sole presence sufficed to defeat. We shall leave himself to declare his tri-

* Dini to Galileo, 2nd of May, 1615, in Venturi.

† Fabroni Lettere, vol. i.

umphs. “My affair has been brought to a close, so far as I am individually concerned: the result has been signified to me by all their eminences, the Cardinals, who manage these affairs in the most liberal and obliging manner (*liberalmente è affettuosamente*), with the assurance that they had felt, as it were with their own hands, no less my own candour and sincerity, than the diabolical malignity and iniquitous purposes of my persecutors. So that, so far as I am personally concerned, I might return home at any moment.”* He did not so return. His characteristic ardour and impetuosity would not let him. He remains to try to sway the ulterior deliberations on the general merits of the question, and to procure a decision that his opinion is in accordance with the Scripture.† For this purpose, having requested and obtained from his court, letters to Cardinal Orsini, who seems to have particularly lent himself to the views of his philosophical friend, he girds his loins for the work, and puts forth that argument upon which, on all occasions, he so fondly relied—the everlasting flux and reflux of the tides. Whether he succeeded in producing, by this boasted argument, the same degree of conviction in the mind of the Cardinal, to whom he inscribed it, as swayed his own breast, does not appear. He, at all events, most unfortunately succeeded in imparting to him no small portion of his own heat and imprudence. It happened, that the consideration of Galileo’s theory was not taken up so warmly as either he or his eminent friend could wish. The Cardinals appeared to them to wax cold upon the subject, and from time to time it was postponed to matters of weightier concern: at length, at a most inopportune moment, when the Pope and Cardinals were engaged in one of their largest congregations, in some deep and important discussion, Orsini, in the most abrupt manner (“*arreptâ potius quam captâ occasione*,” says the historian who narrates the circumstance), interposes, to force on Galileo’s question. Conduct so ill-advised, draws down the immediate reprimand of the Pontiff; still the Cardinal, nothing abashed, returns to the charge, and again interrupts the business in hand. Then, and not till then, did the Pope, under feelings of irritation, declare that *he will* send the whole affair before the Inquisition.‡ Bellarmine, on the moment, is summoned to an audience with the Pontiff, where he is detained in a long and animated conference, which results in the determina-

* Letter to Picchena, 16th February, 1616.

† Despatch of Guicchiardini, 4th March, as quoted by Bergier and Bercastel.

‡ Il quale gli dissi che avrebbe rimesso il negozio a’ Signori Cardinali del S. Offizio è jer l’altro, sento, fecero una congregazione sopra questo fatto per dichiarla tale (eronea è eretica); Guicciardini’s Despatch, 4th March, 1616.

tion instantly to call together a congregation to condemn the proposition. However, even under all these disadvantages, good sense and moderation prevail; and the utter condemnation, said to have been at first contemplated, is, chiefly through the instrumentality of Cardinals Barberini and Cajetan, softened down into a declaration, "that it appeared to be contrary to the sacred Scripture." Such is the account left us by a contemporary, who assisted Galileo in his cause, *and who wrote this account in Rome for the philosopher at his own especial request.**

Thus, it was not, as some Protestant writers would have us believe, pronounced heretical, but untenable in its absolute and unqualified form, until, as Bellarmine decided, a new demonstration should arise to prove its truth; then, as Grassi informs us (*supra*), according to that father, the Scripture interpretation should be altered.

Galileo himself, explaining the same thing *the day after* the decision, in a letter to Picchena, tells him that "the result has not been favourable to his enemies; the doctrine of Copernicus *not having been declared heretical*, but only as not consonant to the sacred Scriptures: whence, the sole prohibition is of those works in which that consonance is maintained."

With regard to the philosopher himself, they deemed it prudent to reduce him to a total silence on the subject. Yet even this step (of silencing him) they did not take but in the last resort, commissioning one of their number (Bellarmine) to intimate to him their decision, and try, by all the arts of friendly persuasion, to engage him to give up "agitating," as the ambassador terms it, the question; and if he had a mind to hold these opinions, to hold them in peace. It was only when this last expedient failed, the biographer in Fabbroni tells us, that Bellarmine called in the public notary and witnesses, to have him juridically bound to silence; and in doing so, dispensed with every circumstance that might tend unnecessarily to irritate his wounded pride. They did not place him at their bar; the witnesses were as few as possible; and the Cardinal furnished him with a certificate to the effect that they did not at all visit him with their displeasure, but left him in the enjoyment of his opinions—opinions then once more not deemed heretical. He was immediately admitted to a long and friendly audience with the Pontiff, and dismissed with every demonstration of favour

* "E cosi," are the words of Geo. Francesco Buonamici di Prato, the authority alluded to above, "si ridussè il decreto Pontificio à temperamento di ordinare che il sistema non si potesse difendere nè tenere, *perche pareva che fosse contraria alla sacra scrittura.*"

and regard. Such is the plain, unvarnished statement of the facts of this (the second) inquiry by the Inquisition into the doctrine and conduct of Galileo: it was of *his own seeking*, against the advice not only of his declared friends, but of some of his judges; it arose out of the attempt, on the philosopher's part, to give the law in the interpretation of Scripture; was marked by heat and intemperance on his side, by kindness and good feeling on that of the court; it left him the enjoyment of his opinions, but reduced him, as "*an ecclesiastical precaution*," to use the words of Venturi, to an absolute silence in doing so: it warred not with the doctrine, for it left every other teacher to enforce the same views; nay, scarcely was the ink dry on the paper that recorded this decision, when the chair of astronomy in the Pope's own university of Bologna, vacant by the death of Magini, was offered to the immortal Kepler; that is, the instruction of the rising generation in heretical astronomy (bless the mark!), is sought to be placed by Rome itself in the hands of, after Galileo, the most active, and, before Galileo, and all others, the most efficient advocate of Copernicanism in his day: not only so, they did not even wait for Kepler to come amongst them to have it taught. We have seen how, in the year before, it was upheld both in the Sapienza and in the Roman College; and now a Theatine father is occupied in enforcing the truth of the same Copernican views.† Why, then, it may be asked, was Galileo, and why Galileo alone, silenced? The answer is ready—because of his extreme intemperance; which is fully evinced by his whole conduct in the affair, and is still farther attested by the ambassador of his Prince, resident on the spot, and who dared not have misrepresented him to a court which idolized him. We shall give the extract from that minister's dispatch: it is dated the 4th of March,—the day before the sentence was pronounced,—and expresses, with great earnestness, the heat of the sage, proof against every expedient to the last.

"Galileo makes more account of his own opinion than that of his friends: and the Lord Cardinal del Monte, and I, so far as lay in my power, *together with many Cardinals of the Holy Office*, have tried to persuade him to keep himself quiet, and not to agitate (*stuzzicare*) this affair, but, if he had a mind to hold this opinion, to hold it in peace [hold a heresy in peace! this from Inquisitors!], and not to make such efforts to draw over others to his way of thinking..... He is heated in his opinions, and displays an extreme of passion, with but little prudence or strength of mind to know how to govern it. He is heated. He is passionate in this affair, and altogether blinded as to how he should act; and will remain so, as he has hitherto done, bringing himself, and every

† Nelli, Vita.

one else who will be fool enough to second his views, or be persuaded by him, into danger. . . . He is vehement, obstinate, and passionate, so that it is impossible that any one around him can get out of his hands.”*

Is it any wonder that, after all this, they should try to tie up these hands by enjoining him to an “opportune silence,” as they called it? He, however, violated this injunction, referring to it, after a lapse of seventeen years, in a most contemptuous and sarcastic style; for that he was indeed arraigned, and finally condemned in 1633; but still treated to the last with every indulgence and consideration for his infirmities and high philosophic character.

It is astonishing how completely this opportune silence was followed by peace in the scientifico-religious world. Galileo, in consequence of the repeated and urgent representations of the Tuscan ambassador at Rome, is gently remanded by his court to Florence, with the aid of an occasional letter, serving as a sort of safety-valve to his restless and dissatisfied spirit. The astronomer returns to his previous calm. He is still admired—still courted as ever: Cardinal Barberini composes verses in his honour, and mounts the papal throne. From that moment Copernicanism is once more in the ascendant. It is enough that any one should be the friend of Galileo, or a partaker in his opinions,—he is immediately placed round the pontifical person, in some post of honour and profit. Castelli is called from Pisa to be mathematician to his Holiness; Cesarini, in whose house Galileo found a home when before the Inquisition in 1616, and who sang the motion of the earth, and the praises of its hero, is made Grand Chamberlain, and would have been honoured with a cardinal’s hat, but for his too early demise (in 1624). Ricardi is made master of the Sacred Palace; Ciampole is made secretary; Campanella, the hot and intemperate, is rescued from the grasp of his Neapolitan jailers, and attached to the papal household; the founder of the French oratory, the celebrated Bérulle, is raised to the dignity of Cardinal, though an avowed Copernican. In fine, Galileo himself comes to Rome, not in consequence of a citation, as Mr. Drinkwater, true to himself, yearns to make us suspect,† but in compliance with the advice of his illustrious friend, Prince Cesi, to offer his congratulations to his brother

* Fabbroni. Even after having been silenced, he could not keep from wrangling and embroiling himself and others in worse than useless arguments on this subject. Hear Guicchiardini, in a despatch written two months after:—“Egli (Galileo) è d’un umore finò da scaponire i frati; e combattere con chi egli non può se non perdere, però un poco prima, or poi, sentiranno costà che sarà cascato in qualche stravagante precipizio.”

† Life of Galileo, c. xii.

academician, Barberini, on his recent elevation to the chair of St. Peter. He is loaded with honours. The substantial proofs of papal partiality and esteem with which he returns to his own country, are recorded in almost every history of the time, and it is unnecessary for us to enumerate them. Suffice it to say they met him in every shape—the cordial interview—the commendatory letter—the pension for himself and his son, came unsolicited, to attest how high the philosopher stood in the papal favour. Not only during the visit is he before the Pontiff's mind. The friends of Galileo in their correspondence testify to the kindness and frequency of Urban's recollections. He is beforehand with his officers in remembering the remittances to be made, and orders them to be increased. Does an unkind word drop from some bigotted friar?—He is immediately reprimanded with the assurance that the Pope and Cardinals have no dearer friend than Galileo.* What more favourable conjuncture for the flux and reflux proof of Copernicanism? The papal pulse is accordingly felt. Those now at the head of affairs are sounded. From one end to the other of the court it is proclaimed that the geocentric doctrine is *not* a matter of faith—that its opposite is *not* heresy. Urban repeatedly expresses himself to the same effect.† All is now bright with promise, and after much manœuvring and characteristic finesse, Galileo surprises his devoted friends, the Maestro di S. Palazzo, and Ciampole, into an approbation of a work which he permitted them but partially to examine. Thus, by conduct such as no one can admire, he succeeds; and, to the wonder of all, comes out with the famous *Four Days' Dialogues*, in which he gives all the preponderance of argument to the opinion of his choice—treating the opposite, and its advocates, with ridicule and contempt. The very first page, addressed *To the Discreet Reader*, most indiscreetly reveals and points the transparent satire against the decree of 1616, *by name*, in a vein of the most bitter irony and sarcasm. It was a daring attempt; and the air of defiance, with which it was paraded, made it scarcely

* When, in 1630, *un certo frate* spoke somewhat insolently of Galileo in the presence of Barberini, he was instantly reprimanded by his Eminence, who observed that the philosopher had no greater friends than his Holiness and himself. This friar may have been Caccini, who is known to have vented his splenetic disappointment about this time, in the bitter remark that, "Galileo's proper place, were he not so protected by the Court of Rome, would be a dungeon."

† In March 1630, the Pope, in a conversation with Campanella, uses these words: "It never was our intention to condemn the Copernican system, and if it depended on us, the decree of 1616 would never have been made." (Castelli to Galileo, who fortifies the relation with the authority of Prince Cesi.) In the year following, speaking with Cardinal Zoller, he emphatically rejects the idea that the new opinion is heretical: adding "it is only rash; and there is no fear that any one will undertake to prove that it must necessarily be true." He might have added, there was still less fear of his succeeding *at the time*.

possible that any tribunal pretending to public respect, should tamely submit to be thus ostentatiously trampled on. The writer has the farther imprudence to put in the mouth of Simplicius, to whom is allotted the task of sustaining the old opinion, the arguments which the reigning pontiff had previously urged against the doctrine of the earth's motion, with the express notification that he heard them from *a most learned and elevated personage* ("gia appreso da dottissima e eminentissima persona.") Gratitude should have taught him to spare this pointed allusion to the first personage in the realm, who was, also, his own most generous benefactor. However, the shaft was sped, and sorely did it rankle in the Pontifical breast. It is said there were not wanting those behind the scenes, who, instigated by secret envy, fanned the flame that was thus lit up. Wounded pride, it is at all events certain, was the passion that urged on the steps that were afterwards taken to vindicate, as was asserted, the violated order of 1616. This was the ostensible ground of complaint. Certainly hostility to science in general, or to the peculiar doctrine of the earth's motion in particular, was not among the motives, real or avowed, that brought down the severity with which the delinquent was at last visited. All the springs of action are laid open in the correspondence of the day. In the important despatches of Nicolini, the resident ambassador of Florence at Rome, we have evidence on the one hand of the Pope's taking up the cause, "*come propria*," and on the other, "that the great difficulty consisted in its being maintained by the cardinals of the congregation, that in the year 1616 a command was laid upon him (Galileo) that he should not dispute nor argue (*discorresse*) on this point. Every thing else seems to be of minor consideration, and more easily got rid of."

The same point is restated in a second letter of the same date, as well as in those of the 23rd of May, 1633; the 18th of June, 1633; the 26th of June, 1633; the 3rd of July of the same year; and the 11th of September of the year previous,—all of which may be consulted in Venturi;—and it is still farther confirmed, if confirmation were necessary, by the authority of Geo. Francesco Buonamici, who expressly testifies, that the Inquisition "solely examined him upon the license and approbation of the book." They demanded of him, why he had not informed the master of the Sacred Palace of the injunction of 1616. He replied, that he thought it was useless. "There," says Venturi, "in rigorous justice, was his fault."

Campanella, altogether in the interest of Galileo, even to violence, with the best opportunities, too, of becoming acquainted with the truth, tells us in the like manner, that the infringement

of the injunction of 1616, was the cause of the proceedings in 1633. See his letter to Galileo, 22nd October, 1632.

Were even this express evidence of the true springs of motion in this unpleasant affair lost to us, it would still be clear, that to whatever cause the prosecution of Galileo might have been owing, it could not be attributable to any unworthy dislike of scientific pursuits generally, nor to the conclusion in question—that of the earth's motion in particular. The character of the times and of the actors of the scene, clearly forbids the supposition. We have before seen, that Urban and his court were rather friendly than otherwise to the doctrine, and regarded it, in a theological point of view, as perfectly harmless. Its most zealous advocates were in favour and in place round his own person. Next, the Jesuits are accused as having urged on the authorities behind the scenes, to exercise the severity they displayed against the poor delinquent. We do not consider it necessary to enquire into the justice of the charge. So far as it is meant generally to affect the society as a body, we deem it unquestionably unjust. Galileo counted many friends in the order, such as Griembergero, Guldino, Tanner, and others. Venturi * tells us, the superiors of that order tried to put a stop to the controversy between himself and Grassi. Monsignor Dini particularizes the Jesuits as the Tuscan's friends, and praises them as counting them the greatest men in their body. Galileo himself has rendered the most ample and unequivocal testimony to the superiority of that religious order, and his own obligations to it. Writing to Prince Cesi, on the 29th of December, 1611,† he thus speaks of Terenzio, a Lyncean, who had then lately joined the Jesuits:—"The news has pained me, by reason of the great loss our society will sustain; but, on the other hand, has given me pleasure, both for the nature itself of the holy resolution, and that a company, to which I am much indebted, has obtained such an acquisition." At the same time, it appears to have been held by the best informed at the period, that many among that celebrated body, were disaffected towards the sage, and were influencing the Holy Father in a spirit that boded no good to the philosopher's peace: but yet, far from their hostility having been owing to any dislike of either science or the new system of the world, it is expressly attributed to their envy and desire to appropriate to themselves the glory of his discoveries. The Heliocentric doctrine was taught in their schools, and still more generally held than taught. Scheiner, for instance, is said to have held it privately, although he did not avow it openly,—

* Parte 2nde, p. 58.† *Giornale Letterario di Roma*, 1749.

perhaps, simply, because it was espoused by Galileo; and in the correspondence of the day, it is expressly affirmed to have been the *favourite* doctrine among the sons of Loyola. The state of feeling, too, in Rome, towards science, was, at the time, most liberal and enlightened,—and far, very far, indeed, in advance of that of those countries, whose principal writers, down even to our own days, have taken particular pleasure in decrying the character of Italy in this respect. Already could she boast of her Leonardo da Vincis — her Fracastoris — her Cesalpinis. Her academies were the result, as they are the proof, of her vigorous and generous love of science; that of the Lyncei* at Rome, would alone do honour to any age and country. Its foundation preceded by half a century that of the Royal Society of London, and of the French Academy of Paris; and was the model, according to Salisbury, on which they were founded. The odour it has left behind it, is shown to be grateful to Romans as well by Odescalchi's work in illustration of its history, got out in the present century in that city, as by the formation, in the last century, of a society in which its honoured name is revived, and which still flourishes under the presidency of Professor Scarpellini.

The noble founder, Prince Federigo Cesi, a name beyond all praise, and to whose memory posterity will yet do justice, was less ardent, if possible, as a lover of science than of religion; yet he collected around him a band of generous students of nature, who gained for themselves so much distinction among their contemporaries, by boldly rejecting the ravings of the Scholastics, that cardinals were ambitious of the honour of being enrolled in their body, and Galileo wished to boast of no higher title than that of *Lyncean*. We have spoken of Cesi's demolition of the solid spheres of Ptolemy; hear how a modern writer speaks of another of his works. "Ces tables (Phytosophicæ) distribuées par accolades, suivant la méthode du temps, offrent de la manière la plus concise et la plus exacte la philosophie botanique telle que l'a conçue, *un siècle après*, le célèbre Linnée, et en rapprochant quelques passages des deux auteurs, *on serait tenté de croire que le naturaliste Suédois les aurait étudiés*, quoique ni lui, ni aucun botaniste jusqu'à Haller, n'ait cité cet ouvrage curieux." No wonder then that a kindred spirit, Dr. Thomas Brown, has immortalized his admiration of the noble naturalist, by gifting the Flora of another world with the name of the illustrious Cesi. To name a few of his associates, is all that is permitted us in the brief observations that remain; but their names are their eulo-

* See Dublin Review, No. V, on *Early Italian Scientific Academies*.

gies,—they are J. Baptista Porta, so well known in optics and pneumatics,—Giovanni Fabri, the anticipator of Redi and Malpighis, in discarding some of the most prevalent errors of his day,—Stelluti, not unprized by geologists;* and Fabio Colonna, a host in himself.

Close upon the demise of Cesi and his Academy, arose another vigorous off-shoot of the scientific intellect of the day, in the Physico-Mathematical Academy of Rome, erected by Ciampini, at the instigation of Cardinal Michael Angelo Ricci. The associates of Ciampini in his scientific labours were Alphonso Borelli, Toricelli, Bianchini, (who constructed the Meridian in the Church of St. Mary of Angels at Rome, and who was pronounced by Newton to be one of the first astronomers of the day, while he was its very first antiquarian) Montanari, and Paul Bocconi; names which shed a lustre round the Physico-Mathematical Society. Nor should we forget that Pope Clement IX was, when Monsignor Rospigliosi, most anxious to see some such Academy erected. This Pontiff was in early youth the auditor of the Jesuit supporter of Copernicanism before mentioned, Torquato de Cuppis, and only withdrew from that learned Professor's lectures to attend those of another still more decided partizan of Galileo's, Benedict Castelli, at Pisa, where he himself became Extraordinary Professor of Philosophy. He was in office under Urban at the time Galileo incurred his master's displeasure; and according to Monsignor Testa, exerted himself to the utmost of his power to defend the accused party; as he did more effectually on a subsequent occasion, the celebrated author of the "*Almagestum Novum*," against the "tracasseries" of an Inquisition,—yet this is the Pontiff whose selection of Leopold de' Medicis for the dignity of Cardinal, has been so stupidly transformed into the groundwork of an accusation against Papal Rome, for its assumed hostility to science. The elevation of Michael Angelo Ricci to the same dignity (of Cardinal,) was another tribute from the Court of Rome to science. We have noticed his share in the creation of Ciampini's Academy. He was so distinguished a proficient in mathematics and physics, that to no other would Alphonso Borelli, that proud but eminent man of science, condescend to submit his dispute with Stephano de' Angelis, and Manfredi, on the theory of his work *De Vi Percussionis*; and it was the same great ornament of the Roman Church, whom the celebrated Academy del Cimento, selected to revise the first volume of its transactions before it would let them appear. Even ecclesiastics who had earned for

* See the 1st volume of Mr. Lyell's admirable work—"Principles of Geology."

themselves an imperishable name in other departments of learning, were found to take the liveliest interest in the study of nature. Witness the celebrated Mabillon, who attended the sittings of the Roman Academy just now mentioned; and the no less celebrated Cardinal Norris, (the descendant, it is said, of an Irish family,) who composed a letter, styled "*beautiful*," on the coral insect, and inserted in the Roman Ephemerides, 1678.—Nothing but the length to which this paper has already extended, would prevent us from proceeding, and showing that neither Italy in general, nor Rome in particular, merits those slights which even Mr. Whewell, whom we would always mention with respect, has joined in putting on both.† Before, however, we proceed to bestow on Mr. Whewell's remarks, that notice to which every thing proceeding from his pen is so justly entitled, it is advisable to take a retrospect of the ground over which we have travelled, and erect some land-mark of truth to fix and attest our progress.

Of the evidence, then, which we have adduced—and in stating it we have held back no one circumstance of the slightest importance—the following appears to us to be the legitimate summary: that the distinguished individual with whose story we have been all this while occupied, was never condemned—never indeed, so much as arraigned—but once; and then not for his science, or his religion, or any other mere matter of opinion whatsoever, but for the *moral* fault of having in a most flagrant manner transgressed a solemn injunction placed on him by the highest tribunal in the land; a tribunal to which he had himself appealed,—whose decision he loudly and pertinaciously demanded, and at last succeeded in extorting. For the transgression of an injunction like this, aggravated, too, by circumstances of insult and contumely against the authority that awarded it, was he condemned for the first and last time, towards the close of his life, 1633; in one word for a grievous contempt of court.

Already had his long and active life, spent in the unwearied prosecution of science, been allowed to draw to its close, without entailing on him, for this hateful exercise of his powers, from Rome and its dignitaries, any severer visitation than what may be summed up under the head of honours, pensions, and caresses, and every other demonstration which the liveliest admiration of talents transcendant as his own, could inspire; and this—while, as if to impart to it the relief of contrast, he was experiencing

† The Marquis de Condorcet, in this matter an unsuspected witness, thus expresses himself on occasion of presenting the bust of the great Cassini to the Academy of Sciences: "Il savoit qu'en Italie ce n'est pas une exclusion pour les places importantes que d'avoir perfectionné la raison par l'étude des sciences; que souvent même elles ont été un moyen de s'élever à ces places."—Cassini's *Mémoires*, 8vo. Paris 1810.

from the countries around, and especially his own (Florence), more or less of petty persecution, and vexatious annoyance. He had taught, published, proclaimed—extended the boundaries of human knowledge to the utmost regions of unexplored space; in fine, pulled down with one hand, the venerable fabric of philosophy that had stood for ages; and with the other, erected on its yet smoking ruins a substitute of a new and altogether different construction. All this he did, not only under the eyes, but cheered by the countenance and applause of Rome: till in an evil hour, as if intoxicated by the universal sway he held in the world of science, and the series of victories he achieved over every successive adversary, as they arose, he burst, in the wantonness of wayward pride, through the restraints of personal respect, public order, and even private gratitude; and levelled the shafts of his satire and contempt against the very highest personage in the land,—the same his own best benefactor. Then, and not till then, was he made to feel the heavy hand of power, when he had stung it to the quick; then, and not till then, was he made to bite the dust of humiliation before the authority he had insulted. Yet, even then, the sage was not forgotten in the delinquent, nor the claims of the “High Priest of science” lost on the clemency and consideration of his judges. He was treated with a leniency, we had almost said a respect, perfectly without parallel in the annals of princely vengeance; and never before or since has power been seen to relax its grasp with so little of injury to the victim, that had the temerity to offend it. Lastly, we have seen that the persons who thus treated this great man, were, in the whole world *at the time*, the most friendly to science; and who looked with the most favourable eye upon the very conclusion for which our own Protestant writers would have it that he suffered; as though Providence, foreseeing the unjust inference that would be sought to be deduced by the enemies of his Church from this remarkable transaction, designed to bring together the circumstances of all others the most happily fitted to expose and defeat it.

As to anything else, we shall not attempt to deny, that, at the period in question, as indeed at all times, there were scattered through the community a number of inferior minds, who, altogether the slaves of Aristotle and the schools, regarded the recent discoveries as so many dangerous innovations: that these men were ready to go any length in the defence of the doctrines and methods to which they were so blindly wedded: that, with an appropriate adaptation of means to their end, they were but too well-inclined to put every gainsayer to the rack, or at least, in prison, in default of any more intellectual way of dealing with

the growing danger : that such minds were to be found, too, in the several subdivisions of the ecclesiastical order, we are equally disposed to admit, and to regard the memory of such men as Caccini with anything but respect ; yet is it no less equally true, as the monuments of that period demonstrate, that such blind and extravagant adherence to the Stagyrice, had its rise solely in the esteem which his genius so justly extorted : that the authority of this philosopher, at all times great, was never held to be unquestionable, as it was never allowed to go unquestioned by some writer or other : that Galileo was not the first to disturb this almost universal sway which he held over the minds of men : that his fortune in the schools has not been uniform, nor his yoke ever tamely submitted to, having been even proscribed in his day by the highest authority : that this blind and extravagant reverence in which his every dictum was held, was confined, for the most part, to the inferior ranks of Churchmen ; and that, in the same proportion in which we at the present day assume or exaggerate the violence with which these men sought to uphold their favourite's sway, in the same proportion do we exalt the character of those who, placed in the post of dignity and ecclesiastical power, checked and defeated the malignant purpose of their bigoted inferiors. Surely, such a character as Maraffi is sufficient to redeem any order of men, even if more steeped in intellectual degradation than the Dominican order are asserted to have been. The apology which that enlightened and generous man made to the wounded feelings of Galileo has been criticised, and, as we think, not without reason, as unjust in its sweeping censure, uncalled-for by its object, and unbecoming in one who, by his position, should have been the father and protector, not the accuser, of the body that placed him at their head. But, at all events, the most inveterate disliker of the religious orders must confess, that the *amende* of Maraffi has left nothing to desire ; that it evinces the quickest sense of the wrong done, and the reparation to be made, and that a body, in which such men as he, and Ricardi, and Nicolo Scomberg, would be sure to be buoyed up, while its Caccinis and Lorinis would be left to grovel in their native mire, must not have been an order altogether insensible to sterling and transcendent merit. It is, then, nothing to say, that, in the religious orders which at the time engrossed almost all the learning of their day, there were to be found, and in no inconsiderable number if you will, men capable of acting a violent and unbecoming part. Shew us, either now or then, the rank or profession, no matter how exalted, that has not its vulgar, and these the greater number ; but it is everything to say, that the bigoted virulence of such creatures was rendered

perfectly innocuous, by the superior wisdom and moderation of the high-minded men who held the reins of ecclesiastical authority. With the support of such, and with the approbation of the respectable of every order, he (Galileo) might have afforded to dispense with the applause or the acquiescence of the less enlightened; but no! the philosophic Aman could not enjoy in peace the favour of the great, while one despised Mardochæus sate in the gate, and rose not to do him homage.

But was not the opinion declared to be heretical? No,—and in thinking otherwise, men permit themselves, perhaps wilfully, to be deceived by the words of course of a legal instrument,—the set phrases of a court of justice, without attending to the public acceptance of those terms, which, more than their grammatical construction, ever decides their meaning. The words “*heretical*” —“*heresy*,” in the sentence of 1633, are but the *stylus curiæ*,—the evidence is most decisive: that of the Pontiff, in whose name it issued, and of the person condemned addressing his very judges. “No!” says Urban, “the Church has not condemned that system, nor is it to be considered as heretical, but only as rash.” Let us now hear Galileo himself standing before the Inquisition in the year named; he speaks of it with the consent and acquiescence of the court, as of a doctrine condemned *ad interim*, “pour le présent condamnée,”*—that is not to be taught in its absolute form, until proved to be true. But do we not see the two propositions, the one declaring the immobility of the sun, the other the motion of the earth, both condemned in the sentence as respectively heretical and erroneous in faith? Yes; but that condemnation is solely the work of the qualifiers—inferior officers of the Inquisition, and not of the Inquisition itself, which merely recites this, together with the other facts of the inquiry of 1616, by way of preamble to their sentence; whereas the Inquisitors did not at all trouble themselves with considering the truth or falsehood—the innocence or poison—of the opinion asserted, but only with the question, whether or not the publication of its defence in the “*Dialogues*” was an infringement of their injunction of 1616? The whole history of the trial proves, that the abstract question they left where they found it. Now, we have had more than ample evidence to show that it was never pronounced heretical.† Why, then, is it styled

* Pièces originales, p. 75, as quoted by Delambre.

† It would be easy to extend that evidence. Thus,—on the 24th of August, 1632, when the *Dialogues* were about to be condemned, a letter was dispatched by order of the Grand Duke, to Rome, in exculpation of his mathematician. It was penned in the name of the Duke’s secretary, Andrea Cioli, but there was no doubt that it was composed by Galileo himself,—Venturi says it is in his hand-writing. That

throughout the sentence a heresy? We have already assigned the reason; it is the style of a court, which, being primarily established "*against heretical depravity*," by a very natural adaptation of language, terms every thing that comes before it "heresy," *even offences not at all against faith; nay, matters of fact which have nothing whatsoever to do with opinion; the sole punishment of excommunication inflicted on the staunchest and most unsuspected in faith of Catholics, for some moral fault, constitutes in the language of the court, a "heretic,"*—and to show that this is not an explanation adopted for the convenience of the occasion, any one that wishes for its confirmation, has only to consult the "*Directorium Inquisitorum*" of Nicholas Eymerick, compiled many a long year before Galileo was thought of.

It was only, then, in that wide, improper, and *technical* sense, that the opinion in the sentence has been denominated a "heresy;" and the circumstance offers no more proof that it was ever held as such in the proper and ordinary sense of the word, than the language of our several courts of law affords to show, that one man had been at such a time in "*the custody of the marshal of the Marshalsea*," while he may never have had the honour of seeing the face of the said marshal, or his Marshalsea,—or that another was a debtor to our gracious Queen, though owing at the moment to her Majesty nought, save that which no Briton worthy of the name will ever tire of either owing or paying—his allegiance. We recollect once hearing an amusing story of a very worthy squire from the west, coming up to town express

letter is demonstrative of the point, that the anti-Copernican doctrine had never been definitely asserted; since in it, Galileo alleges it as a proof, at least of his zeal and well-intentioned interest, that he composed the *Dialogues* with a view of affording those with whom it rested to decide on a point of doctrine, as he says, involving questions about which they could not ordinarily be supposed to be conversant, with the arguments for and against, so as to abridge their labour and expenditure of time; the words are, "That those, with whom it rested to deliberate on such matters, might, with less labour and loss of time, know to which side truth leans, and reconcile accordingly the meaning of Scripture."

In 1624, in his letter to Ingoli, he describes his opinion as barely "suspected;" nay, in his letter to Renieri, in which he gives an account of his final condemnation, he vents himself in bitter complaint, that he was made out "*almost a heretic*."

The truth is, there was no decision to the effect, that the doctrine of the earth's motion was in the strictness of the term heretical,—this we cannot too often repeat. Thus Grassi—thus Bellarmine—thus Urban to Cardinal Zoller, and to Campanella—thus Ricardi—thus Ciampoli—thus the whole court of Rome, described it; thus, with the consent of his judges, (the Inquisition itself) did Galileo more than once, both by word and in writing, describe it. The Jesuits, even those who, like Scheiner, externally combatted it, are asserted to have believed it. In short, as Magalotti, the relative of Pope Urban and one of his cardinals, said, writing to Galileo and Guiducci, "It was not in the power of the holy office to declare it, (or any other doctrine), heresy; it would take an œcumenical council for that."—(*Letter of the 4th of September, 1632.*)

for the sole purpose of chastising an unfortunate barrister who had been constrained to describe him, in the pleadings, as “confederating” and “conspiring.” “Me!” he would exclaim, boiling with rage, “who never confederated or conspired in my life. I’ll teach the rascal what it is to call an O’Branagan a confederator!” and pretty much the same irresistible temptation to smile, do our English self-complacent wiseacres produce in their Italian neighbours, when they are described as deducing, in the plenitude of their sagacity, shrewd consequences from the style of an Inquisitorial decree.*

We now turn our attention to what Mr. Whewell has to say in that singular chapter, (the 4th section of his *Sequel to Copernicus*), which apropos enough, commences with this strange sentence: “We have seen that the doctrines promulgated by Copernicus excited no visible alarm among the theologians of his own time, and we have assigned as a reason for this, that those who were disposed to assert the sway of authority in all matters of belief, had not yet been roused and ruffled by the aggressions of innovators in philosophy and religion, as they soon afterwards were.”† Surely Homer is taking his nap. What! with the work “*De Revolutionibus*” making its appearance in the very midst of all the troubles of the so-called reformation in 1543!

The second paragraph commences with a dictum no less startling in its way, “*In Italy the Church entertained the persuasion that her authority could not be upheld at all, without maintaining it to be Supreme on all points.*” The spirit of dogmatism, &c.” We are almost tempted to hazard an opinion—indeed the risk would not be much—that this (the 4th section &c.) is the part of the work on which the respected Author most prides himself, it is so completely his own—yet, it is not by writing such as this, that Mr. Whewell has attained his present proud position; nor, should he often recur to this style, will he advance his European reputation; it is written—we should hope not conceived—in the spirit of one conscious of addressing a party with whom strength and injuriousness of assertion will

* We had intended to animadvert with some degree of well merited severity upon the disgraceful attempt of Mr. Drinkwater, to entertain the suspicion of Galileo’s having been put to the torture, mainly on the grounds of another of those phrases, “*rigorous examen*,” found in this document; though he had been warned by Brenna, whom he affects to have read, that it also is but a phrase of course; he is too sagacious to have believed it himself; but the same sagacity told him, that it was enough to throw out an injurious suspicion, to have it fix in some minds. But what lays bare the cloven-foot of bigotry in this writer is, his travelling back *nine* centuries to find a make-weight for his charge of superstitious blindness against Rome, in the case of St. Virgil. Want of space alone prevents us from exposing, as it deserves, this piece of ignorant prejudice; but what an implied eulogy, when the link of bigotry has to stretch across the period of nine hundred years, and half the Continent of Europe, to connect the discordant cases of Virgil and Galileo!

† Hist. vol. i. p. 397.

go down for proof. But Mr. Whewell should recollect, that the Church of England is not Christendom; any more than Great Britain is the world; and beyond the narrow circle of the narrow-minded zealots of the Anglican pale, that assertion will excite but a smile, and be forgotten. Unfortunately for its truth, so little is it borne out by the fact, that it is made, by *the Cardinals* and other leading characters of the day, a matter of *personal reproach* against Urban, that he had the overweening vanity to conceive that notion, and to ambition to have a dominion as unquestioned and unbounded in the world of science, as in the religious world. See the life of Ciampoli in Targioni for that saying of a Cardinal, (Bentivoglio) “whose learning and talents (says the writer,) have enhanced the lustre of his birth:” “Egli (il Papa) era sommamente ambizioso di dar leggi à tutta l’università delle scienze; alla qual gelosia &c.”

Having thus established to his own perfect satisfaction, that the Church of Rome assumed on principle a supremacy of dominion in the department of science as complete and unconfined as in matters of religion, Mr. Whewell proceeds to draw therefrom the following conclusion, not unworthy of such notable premises: “It appears” (vol. i. History, p. 400) “not to be going too far to suppose that the extravagant assumption of the Church of Rome, which it was impossible sincerely to allow, and necessary to evade by artifice, generated in the philosophers of Italy an acuteness and subtlety, but also, a suppleness and servility, very different from the vigorous and independent habits of mind of England and Germany.” Now we beg to say it *does appear* going too far in Mr. Whewell, or any other, to suppose anything so insulting to a large and respectable class in an ancient and highly civilized country, not only upon insufficient grounds, but upon such “*extravagant assumption*” as we have shown Mr. Whewell’s to have been,—and it appears to be particularly unwarrantable in an historian of such a thing as science, to attempt to accuse the ancient and venerable Church of such a people, of producing a state of mental servility even in science, unless he were prepared to prove his position beyond all question. Now, we need not say, Mr. Whewell has not done this; how indeed could he? Was it not the country of a Leonardo da Vinci, and of so many others whom we have already named? Did Colbert and Louis XIV think they were introducing a servile and contemptible mind into their kingdom, when they invited Dominic Cassini to lay the foundation of astronomy there? Did the vigorous and independent minds of Germany think with Mr. Whewell, when they travelled into Italy to seek that mental discipline and education in science, which they could not find at home? Did our English Harvey, when he repaired

to Bologna, to acquire, at the feet of its great professors, that insight into physiology that made it scarce a merit in him to discover the double circulation?† Was it not a Cardinal that nurtured the rising genius of Regiomontanus, who was, by the bye, a believer in the Heliocentric doctrine? Was it not the Church of Rome which rewarded his scientific merit with a mitre? To which Copernicus fled for protection, and to whose guardian care he entrusted the offspring of his mighty mind by a dying bequest? If England has the honour of giving birth to the great Newton, where did he find his best commentators? In the priests of Rome. Where did his philosophy find a Lucretius—

“To wed it to immortal verse,”

achieving that, which the witty Voltaire pronounced impossible? in Rome; and who prescribed the theme? A Cardinal (Valenti); and who rewarded the singularly-gifted bard? A series of Popes. And who read and relished him? Not Englishmen—the name of Benedict Stacy is scarcely known amongst them. Or is it because the philosophers of Italy did not throw off the yoke of authority in religion, like their German and English neighbours; seeing that authority was alike established by Jesus Christ, and necessary to save their country from the deplorable scenes that disgraced every nation into which Protestantism has been able to force its way. Is it, therefore, we would ask, they are not to be thought to have possessed vigorous and independent minds? If so, then we all know what the vigorous and independent habits of thought, which Mr. Whewell admires in his English and German friends, means,—it means disregard for that authority of which Christ said; “*He that hears you hears me, and he that despises you despises me*,”—it means that independence of thought, which authorized the most impious and extravagant reveries, and worshipped them as divine; that vigour which unsheathed the sword in every country where Protestantism obtained an hour’s standing, and bathed it in the blood of its fellow-citizens.‡ This is the independence—this the vigour—in which, happily for their country, the Italian philosophers yielded to their ultramontane contemporaries,—but in all that exalts, and refines, and dignifies our nature, how much their superiors! Does Mr. Whewell forget that the contrast has been made and tested? But how different the result from what would justify Mr. Whewell: “There was,” says Mr. Lyell, speaking of the

† There are some who vindicate the honour of this discovery to the Jesuit Fabri, others to Fra Paolo Sarpi.

‡ *Evangelium vult sanguinem*,—the Gospel (meaning the Reformation) demands blood, was the pithy wording of Zuingli for a maxim which Luther and history attest was not allowed to remain a dead letter in the early reforming code.—Vide Erasmi Epist. ad Fratr. Germ. Inf.

geological discussion on the duration of the world, in the sixteenth century (*Principles*, vol. i. p. 36, 5th ed.) “sufficient spirit of toleration and candour amongst the Italian ecclesiastics, to allow the subject to be canvassed with much freedom. They even entered warmly into the subject themselves, often favouring different sides of the question, and however much we may deplore the loss of time and labour devoted to the defence of untenable positions, it must be conceded that they displayed *far less polemic bitterness than certain writers that followed them ‘beyond the Alps,’ two centuries and a half later.*” And farther on, (p. 59) “I return with pleasure,” the same writer says, “to the geologists of Italy, who preceded, as has been already shewn, the naturalists of other countries in their investigation into the ancient history of the earth; and who still (in the 17th and 18th centuries) maintained a decided pre-eminence. They refuted and ridiculed the physico-theological system of Burnet, Whiston, and Woodward; while Vallisneri, in his comments on the Woodwardian theory, remarked how much the interests of religion, as well as those of sound philosophy, had suffered by perpetually mixing up (as their English neighbours had done, and have continued to do) the sacred writings with questions in physical science.” Who showed here the vigorous and independent habits of thought? And to show how little qualified some people are, even to imitate a bright example, let us hear Mr. Powell (p. 187), for we love poetic justice: “No one now doubts the truth of the solar system; or is led to reject revelation on the ground of its being at variance with it,” (yet) “the fact is, the very same difficulties and objections are still alleged by many at the present day, not, indeed, with regard to the solar system, which, very inconsistently, they admit, but in reference to the discoveries in geology. *We have at the present day zealots animated by as bitter a spirit of persecution, though happily without the power to execute it, as those of the Roman tribunal.*” Even Mr. Whewell, himself, has not that implicit faith in the vigorous intellect of his countrymen being such as to carry them through “*dilemmas*” similar to those which he supposes to have arisen in the days of Galileo, but through which, as we have shown, the cardinals of Rome clearly saw their way—dilemmas that have arisen, and will arise, in number and form such “as we can hardly foresee,” presenting “*questions of no small real difficulty,*” and to meet which the learned author candidly acknowledges his inability to “lay down an adequate canon.” Now we think there can be no better canon than that laid down by the cardinals in the case of Galileo. Let men of science pursue their own proper train of investigation, keeping aloof from all theological reasonings. Let them leave to the religious world its own way of interpreting the

Scriptures, taking care like true philosophers not to propound their conclusions as certain truths, however probable, until they shall have been rigidly demonstrated; and then, when the physical demonstration arrives, he must be a fool who will not interpret revelation accordingly. This to be sure may offer a serious difficulty to the Protestant, who has already decided for himself, (*and on Protestant principles no decision can go higher*) that his interpretation is right, and to surrender that interpretation at the shrine of human science would to be invert the order of things, and make the word of God, as the Protestant deems it, subservient to human reason: but for the Catholic, who can irrevocably hold to no one tenet as divine, but that which has been proposed as such by the great living—speaking authority, which has been established by Christ “to teach all nations the things he has commanded,” and which has never pronounced upon such philosophical opinions, there can be no difficulty. He knows that the truths of nature and supernatural revelation can never be at variance, and it can only follow, at worst, that *his* interpretation has been wrong. But to return to astronomy. If Bullialdus and Gassendi and Castelli were priests of that Church that acknowledges Rome for its head, they also coincided with Galileo. If Ramus was a Protestant and an Aristotelian, he was no less opposed to the movement of the earth. If Osiander was bold as a reformer, he was timid in asserting the Heliocentric doctrine. If the Inquisition at Rome prohibited the teaching of a problem for an ascertained truth, opposed as it was to the letter of Scripture, the greatest Protestant astronomer of them all (Tycho) not only proved that it was a problem, but became the apostle of the opposite opinion, and made a proselyte on theologic grounds of his Protestant friend Rothman. If in Italy it could boast not a few friends as well as many enemies, in England it was scouted by the renowned Bacon; rejected by the illustrious Gilbert; written against by Alexander Ross; and if taught by Bishop Wilkins, it was not without finding it necessary to satisfy his Protestant readers, that the Scriptures were not insuperably against it. Nor when the Italian Bruno taught the earth’s motion in our island, do we find he made any converts among “the vigorous and independent thinkers of England.”

But to return;—there is a loftiness in the air with which every little Protestant takes his fling at the Church of Rome, on the subject of Galileo, as though he were as strong in conscious rectitude as to be perfectly unassailable on that point. They have certainly very convenient memories, these our Protestant

friends; the story of Galileo is as fresh with them as though it were of yesterday—while they forget “those modes of inquisition” (as Burke said), “that should never be named to ears organized to the chaste sounds of equity and justice:”—that barbarous code whereby they enacted ignorance and proscribed a nation’s mind, making it felony for the professors of the religion of their fathers, to get taught at home, and double felony to get taught abroad. They talk of Copernicus and Galileo, as though they knew what they were talking about. Do they know that in the sentiments of Galileo one of the proudest achievements of Copernicus’s genius, was the reformation of the Calendar, in which he had so large a share? and what was it, that kept “the vigorous and independent minds of England,” for full two centuries, from adopting that improvement which has made nearly all Europe its debtor? Sheer bigotry—hostility to science through religious hate,—yes! they had rather quarrel with the whole host of the heavens, than agree with the Pope in counting time. It was a just humiliation, when at length they were driven into its adoption, and obliged to call in the aid of those Catholic talents they had proscribed in the person of Bishop Walmesley. For the solitary instance of Galileo, how many a Galileo could we not point out in Protestant history? How was not Descartes hunted down by the churchmen of Holland? How was not poor Christian Wolff, the most amiable of men,—a man who may be said to have raised the superstructure, if not laid the foundation, of the philosophy of his day? He was persecuted, not indeed as Galileo, for Galileo was not exiled from his country, nor stript of his honours and emoluments,—but poor Wolff suffered this and more, and from the ministers of his own persuasion; by them he was denounced to the secular power, not as an innovator, but as an atheist,—a confederate of Spinoza’s. It was not a mere Gerundian text from an obscure Friar that was hurled at him,—but it was the celebrated Franké, the founder of *the Orphan House*, that, prostrate in his church, gave God thanks publicly, that the inoffensive sage was banished his home—his kindred—his friends.* Such was the savage triumph over a fallen victim; while there was no Maraffi found to make the *amende*, and soothe the outraged feelings of the injured man. No! but the sacred name of the Divinity was solemnly invoked, to sanction and approve the pride of ferocious bigotry.

Let the English portion of our revilers, ere they would again open their lips on this subject, go read their own history at this very period, and see what it exhibits. What Pope half so infalli-

* This fact has been wisely passed over in silence in the life of Franké, which has lately issued from the English press.

ble as the Protestant Pope, James I? What scenes more calculated to excite inexpressible disgust and contempt in every ingenuous mind than the history of the Reformed Churches throughout Europe at that moment? To see the Synod of Dort—that Protestant general council convened by Pope James, ratifying its decrees in the blood of the patriot Barneveldt, and Moloch-like demanding for its victims whole hetacombs of its own children; its Grotiuses among the rest. What Inquisition more complete than the hateful Star-chamber? or, the High-Ecclesiastical Commission-court for the suppression of heresy, “Whereby,” says the Act 16 Charles I, that abolished it, “the king’s subjects sustained great and insufferable wrongs and oppressions.” Let them read the degradation of their nation in the persecution of the unhappy Edmund Peacham, the Somersetshire clergyman, victimized for a sermon, which he never preached or published—which, perhaps, he never intended to preach—for no earthly crime, but that it was possible he might preach it—questioned the poor old creature, in the graphic language of the record, “before torture, in torture, between torture, and after torture,” for matter of accusation against himself; then, in the absence of proof thus cruelly sought for, tried and found guilty, and at length expiring the victim of the foulest conspiracy. King, ministry, every judge in the land but one, and a jury of Englishmen, all co-operating to crush a poor feeble country curate.

Should any one take it into his head to move in the next session of parliament for aid to promote any one object of science at Maynooth—how would the loudest declaimers about the ignorance and superstition of the Church of Rome be found to vote?—our lives for it, against the motion; though even for the sake of trying to distract the attention of the Irish priest from his much dreaded electioneering avocation, the experiment would be worth the making. Will they vote for a grant to erect a printing press there? for the enlargement of its scanty library? for the purpose of a modern philosophic apparatus? With the strongest desire to see the scientific education of their *Alumni* achieved, and every facility for that purpose attained, are not the trustees notoriously apprehensive of rousing the rabid hostility of the declaimers against ignorance and popery by a demand for parliamentary aid for these purposes? If these persons truly love science, let them come forward and vote a few thousands for this lauded and laudable object. Then may we chance to believe they truly love science for its own sake. But why do we speak of such things? Are they not at this very hour throwing every

obstacle in the way of the education of a whole nation, because they are papists and not to be proselytized? Have they not recently displayed the same spirit against their fellow Protestants by opposing their admission to the Universities, simply because they were more practically Protestant than themselves, having dared to use their right of private judgment, and differ with the Establishment? Intolerance indeed! A Protestant should be the very last to mention the word. “Ils sont les plus intolérans de tous,” says Rousseau, speaking of the Protestant Churches, “car ils sont intolérans sans savoir pourquoi.”

ART. VI.—*Minutes of Evidence taken before the Select Committee on the Kinsale Election Petition.*

THE history of the Spottiswoode Fund being already well known to the public, we shall content ourselves in this paper with making a few comments on the composition of the confederacy by which it was raised, and with stating the results of which it has been productive.

The committee which undertook the management of the *Sacred Fund*, consisted of twenty-three individuals. Of these, nine were attorneys, one a conveyancer, and two equity draughtsmen. The rest were a compound of printers, bankers, accountants, appraisers, *et hoc genus omne*.

The purity of these gentlemen's motives is, of course, above suspicion; nay, opposed to them as we are in politics, the pious and constitutional object for which they combined attracts our admiration. The people of Ireland had, at the general elections just then concluded, returned a larger majority of Liberal representatives than they had done at any former period. The attorneys, printers, and appraisers, of the British metropolis, saw at once the danger which threatened Toryism and the empire from this extraordinary influx of “Papists and Ribbonmen,” and accordingly meditated on the means of rescuing both from their impending dissolution. The only feasible mode for effecting this laudable object which presented itself to their consideration, was to cut away this “alien” majority, and to replace it by an equal number of loyal Conservatives. Men of ordinary capacities would not have been able to discover the means of removing so large a majority; but these Spottiswoode confederators thought at once of Tory committees. These worthies knew that if they could secure majorities of men of their own moral and

political complexion on those tribunals, there could be no doubt as to the result. They were not hot-headed enthusiasts, but cool, calculating men of business. They knew the nature of the tools wherewith they were to work out their own profit, and their party's salvation. More than one-half of them were lawyers. These had had long experience in the tactics of election committees, and had seen, in the course of their own practice, how pliable to the purposes of faction were the Tory majorities of those tribunals. They knew by experience that those men would not be grievously shocked if their *political bias* should happen to promote the success of their own political partisans. This was not a novel feature in the history of that faction: the packing of juries had been the appropriate archetype of the packing of committees. As these were the principles of the party, and as the general election afforded an opportunity for carrying them out on an extensive scale, these Spottiswoode combinatorians were right in recommending their "persecuted Irish brethren," to petition against every return where they could discover the least pretext for a Tory committee to set aside the popular representative, or to ruin him by the expense of a protracted inquiry. From the experience of every preceding session, they expected to have majorities of their own party on the committees of the present; and with them it was not the nature of the cause, but the composition of the tribunal, which was the object of attention. How just they were in their estimate of the feelings of their Tory fellow-countrymen, and how complete would have been their success had the destinies of the ballot-box given them the *proper* committees, must be manifest from a glance to the course of the proceedings in any one case in which a Tory committee has had to decide on an Irish election petition. Fortunately for Ireland, the announcement of their scheme aroused the Reformers of both kingdoms, and drew attention to the subject.

In consequence of the excitement produced by the proceedings of this extraordinary confederacy, a greater number of petitions was presented by both Liberals and Tories, than had been known on any former occasion. As those presented by the Liberal party were few, and can be quickly disposed of, we give them in the first place. In the subjoined table, we give the numbers polled for the successful candidates against whom petitions were presented, and for those whom the petitioners sought to have returned :—

	<i>Sitting Members.</i>	<i>Nos. Polled.</i>	<i>Liberal Candidates.</i>	<i>Nos. Polled.</i>	<i>Majority.</i>
Carrickfergus	P. Kirk	446	D. Rennie	418	28
•Downpatrick	David Kerr	190	J. C. White	131	59
†Kerry County	A. Blennerhasset	546	Hon. F. W. Mullins	498	48
Newry	J. Ellis :	338	D. C. Brady	305	33
†Portarlinton	Hon. G. L. D. Damer	—	F. Dunne	—	—
Sligo County	Alexander Percival	439	D. Jones	353	86
Tralee	J. Bateman	75	M. O'Connell	64	11

Gross majority of Conservatives over the Liberals on six petitions 265

Of the above petitions, those from Carrickfergus, Downpatrick, Portarlinton, and Sligo County, were abandoned before the committees had been struck. The petition from Kerry was abandoned after a Liberal committee had assembled to try its merits, on the counsel finding that they could not succeed without entering into a scrutiny, which would be both tedious and expensive. In the Newry case, the petitioner was defeated before a Tory committee on the following technical ground:—It may be proper to premise, that the petitioner's counsel, in his opening statement, declared, that the only question for the committee to try, would be as to whether the sitting member had a sufficient property qualification. § On the first witness being called, he stated, that his father, the returning officer of Newry, had set out for London to produce the poll-books on the trial of this petition, but that, on his arrival in Dublin, a disease, from which he had been suffering for some time, had so increased, as to render it necessary for him to undergo a surgical operation, which prevented his coming farther. He, however, sent the witness over with the poll-books, having first sealed them up in his presence. The witness produced them in the same sealed state in which he had got them from his father. The committee held that this was not a sufficient proof of the authenticity of these books, and thus put an end to the inquiry. The connexion between the authenticity of the poll-books, and the qualification of Mr. Ellis, being to us imperceptible, we recommend our readers to compare this decision with that of the Waterford

• There were two other candidates, but neither was concerned in the petitions presented.

† Mr. M. J. O'Connell polled 697 votes. There was no petition against his return.

‡ The numbers polled for the respective candidates are not mentioned in the petitions, and we have not been able to find them in any other document. The voters cannot be numerous, as the population is little more than 3000.

|| E. J. Cooper, a Conservative, is the other member—polled 502.

§ In the petition the charges were, want of qualification, treating, bribery, intimidation, and unduly and illegally influencing the electors. These latter charges had been given up; they could not be afterwards relied on, as they had been omitted from the opening statement.

(Tory) committee, where, as the petitioner's case could not proceed without the poll-books, the preparation of the evidence as to the authenticity of them, should have claimed special attention.

In the Tralee case, Mr. M. O'Connell had been deprived of the return through the extraordinary decision of the assessor, on two of the most frivolous objections that had ever been raised. One of these was, that the form of the certificate of registry in the schedule of the Reform Act, had the words, "was this day duly registered," and that in the certificates objected to, the words "*this day*" were omitted; though the date was written at the bottom of the document, where the registering barrister affixed his signature. The other objection was, that some voters had not specified, in their affidavits of registry, the street, lane, or place, in which they resided, but merely described themselves as "of Tralee, in the borough of Tralee;" they had particularly specified the street, lane, or place, where the premises lay, out of which they sought to qualify. The committee reversed the decisions of the assessor on both objections; and placed on the poll sixty-nine votes for Mr. M. O'Connell, and thirty-three for Mr. Bateman, which had been rejected on the above grounds, at the election. This gave the former gentleman a majority of twenty-five on the gross poll. In addition to the obviously frivolous nature of these objections, we may observe, that it was the clerk of the peace, and not the voters, who had to prepare the certificates and affidavits; and that it is an indisputable principle of law, that where an elector has done everything in his power to secure his right to the franchise, he is not to be prejudiced by the neglect or ignorance of any officer over whom he has no controul.* The decision of the committee, which consisted of Liberals and Conservatives, was unanimous on the first objection. The propriety or justice of either decision has never been questioned.

Thus, of the three cases in which the Liberal party proceeded till a committee had been struck, one was abandoned, although the political feelings of the majority of the Committee were similar to those of the petitioners: the second was defeated before a Tory committee, on a technical objection arising from circumstances which it was impossible to prevent or to anticipate: and in the third, the Liberal candidate was declared duly elected by two decisions, to the justice of which no man, and to the legal propriety of which no lawyer, could raise an objection.

* See post p. 125.

We now subjoin the list of the returns against which petitions were presented, at the instigation of the Spottiswoode confederacy:—

	<i>Sitting Members.</i>	<i>Nos. Polled.</i>	<i>Tory Candidates.</i>	<i>Nos. Polled.</i>	<i>Majority.</i>
Belfast	James Gibson . . .	941	J. E. Tennent . . .	901	40
.	Earl of Belfast . . .	922	G. Dunbar	869	53
Carlow (County) .	J. A. Yates	730	T. Bunbury	643	87
.	N. A. Vigors	730	H. Bruen	643	87
Carlow (Borough)	W. H. Maule	180	F. Bruen	158	22
Dublin	D. O'Connell	3556	G. A. Hamilton . . .	3467	89
.	J. Hutton	3542	T. B. West	3461	81
Kinsale	P. Mahony	103	Col. H. Thomas . . .	98	5
Limerick (County)	Col. Fitzgibbon . . .	858	A. S. O'Brien	14	844
.	W. S. O'Brien	853	W. Maunsel	0	853
Longford	Luke White	650	A. Lefroy	522	128
.	Col. Henry White . . .	648	C. Fox	502	146
*Queen's County	J. W. Fitzpatrick . .	943	Hon. T. Vesey	894	49
Sligo (Borough) .	J. P. Somers	263	J. Martin	208	54
†Waterford (City)	H. W. Barron	583	W. Beresford	426	57
Westmeath	M. L. Chapman	840	R. Handcock	393	447
.	Sir R. Nagle	798	Sir R. Levinge	388	410
Wicklow (County)	J. Grattan	697	Col. Acton	623	74
.	Col. R. Howard	690	R. Humphries	6	684
Youghal	F. J. Howard	158	W. Nicol	150	8

Gross majority of Liberals on thirteen Tory petitions 1904†

The reader will see, by comparing this list with that of the returns against which the Liberal party petitioned, how indifferent the Tories were to any odds of numbers against them, provided they had the selection of the judges.

There were some peculiarities connected with this batch of petitions, which should never be forgotten. In all of them there were those charges of bribery, corruption, intimidation, personation, and illegal influencing of voters, which Tory agents were so pre-eminently qualified to depict. In nine§ of them there were special charges against Catholic clergymen. In two|| of them the agents and servants of the crown were accused of using their official power and influence in endeavouring to procure the return of the Liberal candidates; and in two¶ only did the petitioners confine themselves to the common beaten path of bribery,

* Sir C. Coote is the other member for this county.
† T. Wyse is the other representative for this city. There was no petition against his return.
‡ We here give the result between the favourite candidates on each side, as being more likely to shew the relative strength of the parties. The result between the second candidates on each side, gives a majority of 2314 against the Tory petitioners.
§ Carlow county, Carlow borough, Kinsale, Limerick county, Longford, Queen's county, Sligo borough, Westmeath and Wicklow.
|| Dublin and Belfast.
¶ Waterford and Youghal.

corruption, and intimidation by mobs, &c. &c. That our readers may see how regardless of even the semblance of truth were the concoctors of these national libels, we shall lay before them a few extracts illustrative of the charges against the Catholic clergy.

The petition from the county of Limerick, after setting forth an awful catalogue of other grievances, complains, that "the priests and Roman Catholic clergymen of the said county, interfered with and influenced the electors of the Roman Catholic persuasion in the most illegal, violent and unconstitutional manner, in order to compel them to vote," &c. &c. "and did actually beat and violently assault some of the said electors, who refused to promise to vote according to the wishes and orders of the said priests," &c. &c.; "that several Roman Catholic priests used their influence in collecting said mobs, which they afterwards headed and led on in attacking the friends and supporters of the said Augustus Stafford O'Brien and Henry Maunsell;" and that "several mobs, headed by Roman Catholic priests and other partisans of the said," &c. &c. "not only continued publicly to parade the streets of the said city of Limerick in a revolting and alarming manner, but proceeded to commit divers gross outrages and assaults on the electors in the interest of the said Augustus Stafford O'Brien and Henry Maunsell." In the Longford petition, we are told that the Catholic priests denounced "the said Anthony Lefroy and Charles Fox as enemies of the people, and called over, standing at the altars and doors of said chapels, the names of the voters in their parishes, who were usually in the habit of attending at said chapels, and then and there caused and compelled such voters to stand forward and sign a paper, or put their marks thereto, pledging themselves to vote for said Luke White and Henry White." In the Queen's county petition, we are told, among other things, that the priests induced the people to believe that they would "incur the risk of damnation if they voted for the said Honourable Thomas Vesey." In this manner the charges against the Catholic clergy for "influencing the electors in a most illegal, violent, and unconstitutional manner," are repeated throughout the nine petitions with such a slight but judicious variation of circumstances, as would give them at least an air of probability.

The charges of intimidation are, of course, truly terrific. In the Longford petition we are told that "by night, armed parties went about to the houses of the voters supposed to be in the interest of the said Anthony Lefroy and Charles Fox, who took from their beds the said voters, threatened them, and, after placing them on their knees, swore them, on pain of death and de-

struction to themselves and their families, not to vote for the said Anthony Lefroy or Charles Fox, but to vote for the said Luke White and Henry White; and in order farther to intimidate, in many instances dug graves near the residences of said voters." From this charge we will leave our readers to judge of the others. For what crimes would be too improbable to be imputed to a party, who, in the course of their canvass, to secure a vote, would not stop at what would be very little if at all short of a felony?

The charges of the illegal exercise of the official influence of the crown, were naturally to be expected from the party who, during the long period of their ascendancy, had never allowed an election to pass without employing the agency of the Castle for the purposes of corruption. They, not supposing it possible that any men could resist such temptations, and wishing, perhaps, to sanction their own mal-practices by alleging that they still served as precedents for the guidance of others, accused their opponents of following the same course which they themselves had been pursuing for ages.

Such is a brief outline of the calumnies heaped on the Liberal party of this country. Yet what will our readers think of the veracity of Tories, when they find that *not one of those charges* did the petitioners dare to bring to investigation before a committee, except a charge of bribery against one of the members for Waterford, to which we shall presently call attention. So conscious were they of the utter groundlessness of these fabrications, that, in the statements required by law to be given in immediately before the sitting of the committee, they, in most cases, made not the slightest allusion to them, but confined themselves to the scrutiny of the qualifications of the candidates or the voters.

Though the petitioners had never any intention to bring these charges to investigation, they were necessarily compelled to introduce them into the petitions, as it was on the pretence that these offences against "the freedom and purity of election" had been committed, that the *Sacred Fund* was founded. But though this might have been one reason for giving circulation to these wholesale national calumnies, we cannot believe that it was the only one. The vilifying and misrepresentation of the Irish formed the basis of the system on which the ascendancy party had been acting for centuries. They were continually representing the Irish as the lowest and most degraded of mankind, and as the enemies of Britain, so as to make them the objects of the contempt and detestation of Englishmen. Had they not succeeded in making the people of England believe those imputations, they never would have been allowed to proceed in their

course of massacre, spoliation, and oppression. Misrepresentation had ever been with them the prelude to every species of misrule; and it seems to be even still the "sacred and inalienable" privilege of the party. Having been so long in the habit of plundering and oppressing the Irish, why should they not still continue to malign them? We cannot believe that even the conscientious and "holy men" of that party ever deemed it criminal to falsely vilify the Irish Catholics; for how could it be criminal to calumniate them, when it was not criminal to rob them of their property, and put them out of the pale of the constitution, "for the honour and glory of the Lord, and the advancement and security of the Protestant religion"?

We sincerely hope that Englishmen will be taught by the issue of these petitions, to estimate the credibility of Tory fabrications against the character of Irishmen. They have believed them too long, and, as we may show on another occasion, have paid dearly for their credulity. Let them only consider that these Tories did not hesitate to present thirteen petitions to the House of Commons, containing the grossest imputations against the Irish Liberal party, the truth or falsehood of which would be discovered within six or seven months at the utmost, and of the utter falsehood of which they themselves were so conscious, that they never alluded to them when the time for substantiating them had arrived; and then let Englishmen ask themselves, what imputations would these Tories hesitate to make, when there would be no chance of their being so speedily detected?

Of the thirteen petitions, one only was abandoned before a committee was struck. That was the one from the county of Limerick, in which the petitioners were particularly bound to proceed, as the conduct of the Tory landlords and clergymen was put in issue by a petition from two of the electors, praying to be admitted parties to defend the return, who accused "several of the landlords, and some few of the clergymen of the Protestant religion," of aiding and assisting in procuring, and of paying for, the attendance of mobs to intimidate the Liberal electors; of locking up and detaining in imprisonment several electors who would have voted for the Liberal candidates; and of endeavouring "to influence the electors of the Roman Catholic persuasion, over whom they had control, either as landlords, claimants of tithe, composition, or other liabilities, in the most illegal, violent, and unconstitutional manner."

In the Carlow county, Carlow borough, Longford, Queen's county, and Wicklow cases, the petitioners gave up the contest on the committees refusing to open the registries. With the propriety of these decisions, few unprejudiced minds will be found

to quarrel. As this question has been so repeatedly discussed, it would be now useless for us to offer any remarks on the legal portion of the subject. But to common justice and to common sense we can conceive nothing more irreconcilable than that men's qualifications should be destroyed before a committee in London, though they had never been questioned on the spot, where alone they were capable of a fair investigation. Men are allowed to register, and if they vote for the Conservative candidate, all is right; but if not, their franchises are attacked before a tribunal sitting 500 or 600 miles from their home, without their having the slightest notice of the intended attack, or the means to rebut it. For it should not be forgotten, that it is only on the day on which the committee first meet, that the lists of votes objected to on each side are exchanged.* By the practice of opening the registries, one party may strike off the votes of half a county through the neglect or ignorance of the other party, or his inability to meet the necessary expenses; and thus the electors would be deprived of their rights on issues raised without their knowledge or consent, between two claimants for a seat in the legislature. Is not such a practice inconsistent with that first principle of the law of England, that no man should suffer in his person, property, or rights, until he should have a fair opportunity of defending himself? If the franchise be "the noblest birthright of a British subject," as one of our most eminent judges once termed it, why should he be so unceremoniously deprived of it, while he cannot be deprived of any other right, or of any portion of his property, without a fair notice and a fair trial, on an issue, in which he himself must be one of the principals?

In the Sligo borough case, the only subject relied on by the petitioners, was an alleged want of qualification in the sitting member. But it appeared that he had property sufficient to qualify him not only for a borough, but almost even for a county. The petitioners so far failed in proving their allegation, that they only *escaped* having their petition declared frivolous and vexatious. We may here mention a curious discrepancy between several witnesses relative to the value of one portion of that gentleman's property, to show the absurdity of committees in London deciding on the value of lands in Ireland, on the evidence of engineers, surveyors, and such other theoretical gentlemen, who have no practical knowledge of husbandry,—who never tenanted an acre of land in their lives,—and who know nothing

* Yet in cases of controverted elections from Scotland, and from counties in England and Wales, the list of objected votes must be given in *ten* days before the meeting of the committee. In the cases of cities or boroughs in England or Wales, they must be sent in *five* clear days, exclusive of the day of delivery.

of its value, except what they hear from those employed in its management, or what they read in their "ready-reckoners." Finding in these little treatises the value of alluvial, sandy, loamy, mountain, and other soils, laid down with extraordinary nicety and discrimination, these gentlemen, when they enter on a farm, imagine, in all the pride of science, that they can tell its value with the same mathematical precision as they tell its measure. Hence arise those discrepancies between them and practical husbandmen, which committees are frequently rather puzzled to reconcile. In the present case, four witnesses were called by the petitioners to reduce the value of one portion of the sitting member's property. One, a surveyor, who valued it for the Tithe Commissioners, fixed its value at £84. 16s. a-year; another, who valued it for the county cess, estimated it at £125; a third, the county coroner, valued it at £140; and the fourth, an engineer, at £150. The lands were actually let by one joint lease to several tenants at £310 a-year, from the 1st November, 1836; and the agent of the sitting member proved that he had received the rents at that rate. A farmer, who knew the lands well, proved that they were worth that sum.

The Dublin petition attracted such general attention at the period of its being under investigation, that, notwithstanding its importance, we scarcely feel warranted in laying before our readers more than a general condensed view of the objections to the several classes of voters, which were argued before the committee.

There were twenty-eight classes of objections delivered in by the petitioners. The first of these was of the following nature: The form of the affidavit of registry in the schedule to the Irish Reform Act had these words,—“and that the said premises are *bona fide* of the clear yearly value of not less than ten pounds.” In the affidavits objected to, the word “*yearly*” had been, by some accident, omitted. Objections of this nature had been provided against by the 20th section of the Reform Act.—“And be it enacted, that every such affidavit shall be signed by the barrister or chairman before whom the same shall be taken, and shall be by him delivered to the clerk of the peace, or his deputy, as the case may be, to be filed and kept amongst the records of the county, city, town, or borough; and such barrister is hereby required to take care that such oaths shall be agreeable to the form hereby prescribed, or as near thereto as may be; *and no objection in point of form shall at any time hereafter be allowed to any such oath when signed.*” The committee did not allow the objection. This decision affected 208 votes.

The second class of objections affected 458 voters, whose “cer-

tificates and affidavits of registry were materially defective and illegal." This class was abandoned without a contest or an argument.

The third question raised was respecting 92 freemen, who, in the language of the petition, had been rejected at the poll by the assessor, "on the futile and immaterial pretext that they had been registered within six calendar months previous to the teste of the writ." These men had been registered on the 3rd of March, and were brought to the poll on the 5th of August, the last day of the election, when their party had despaired of success, and would hazard anything for even the semblance of victory. The only ground on which it was pretended that these men were entitled to be placed on the poll was, that they were freemen of right, and that, as such freemen could, before the Reform Act, by 4 Geo. IV, c. 55, sec. 32, vote at any time after their admission, they were not deprived of this privilege by any provision of that statute. But, by the Reform Act,* no man has a right to vote till he has been registered in the manner directed by that Act; and then, as to the time at which he can vote after such registration, the 29th section provides, that every person registered at the first sessions after the passing of the Act, should be entitled to vote immediately after such registration; "and that any person who shall, at any time after such first sessions, duly register his vote according to the provisions of this act, shall be entitled to vote at any election to be held by virtue of any writ tested six calendar months *at least* after such registry." Hence no man can now vote,† let him claim the franchise in what manner he will, till he has been registered six calendar months at least previous to the teste of the writ of election. But it did not appear by the certificates that these were freemen of right, as the certificates did not state the rights on which they had been admitted, whether of birth, marriage, service, or *grace especial*. It was admitted by the counsel for the petitioner, that if they were not freemen of right, they could not vote till they had been registered six months. By the cross-examination of Mr. Archer, the only witness called by the petitioners, it appeared that they could not be freemen of right, as that gentleman swore that no right to the freedom by reason of birth, marriage, or service, or of any statute, existed in the corporation. Hence the committee were right, on either ground, in refusing to put these names on the poll.‡

* Section 13.

† There is an exception in the statute with regard to Trinity College.

‡ The Tory party had twice admitted, by their own practice, that freemen could not vote till six months registered, as they had many such freemen at the two preceding elections, but did not attempt to poll them.

We may here remark, that since the passing of the Reform Act, the corporations of Dublin, Youghal, and some other places, which had never before admitted men to the freedom on the ground of right by birth, marriage, or service, have been since in the habit of admitting them on these pretended rights. This was distinctly proved on the investigation of the Dublin and Youghal petitions. Those corporations had never before recognized a right in any body to the freedom, and had exercised an absolute discretion of admitting or rejecting at will. All the freemen of those corporations were consequently honorary freemen, who seem to be distinctly defined by the 9th section of the Reform Act as persons not having a right to the freedom, "by reason of birth, marriage, or service, or of any statute now in force." By a clause in that section it was provided "that no persons, who since the 30th day of March, 1831, have been, or hereafter shall be, admitted as honorary freemen, shall be entitled, by virtue of such admission, to vote or register as freemen under this Act."* By this proviso, every freeman of those corporations admitted since the 30th of March, 1831, was disqualified from voting for a Member of Parliament. To defeat this enactment those corporations have been since in the habit of admitting freemen on the pretended rights of birth, marriage, or service. No less than one thousand freemen, according to the evidence of Mr. Archer, have been admitted on these collusive grounds by the Dublin corporation since the passing of the Reform Act.† The importance of striking off these fraudulent votes may be estimated from the following classification of the electors, who polled for the rival candidates:—

<i>O'Connell and Hutton.</i>	<i>Hamilton and West.</i>
1690 Freeholders & Leaseholders	1065 Freeholders & Leaseholders
1830 Householders	652 Householders
136 Freemen	1750 Freemen‡

* See the entire section in page 137, *post*.

† From 1831 to the middle of 1837, 866 freemen passed the corporation; of these only four voted for Mr. O'Connell, and two plumped for Mr. Hutton. At the election in January 1835, Mr. O'Connell and his colleague were returned by a majority of upwards of 220. The corporation immediately set about creating freemen. In the four preceding years there had been only 123 admitted. In 1835 and 1836 no less than 424 were admitted. The manufacture is progressively increasing, as we find 223 admitted at the single assembly at Michaelmas last.

‡ This table may not be perfectly accurate, in consequence of double registries, splitting of votes, &c., but it may be relied on as being in the main correct. These relative numbers have been frequently noticed in the public papers. The Conservative candidates have attempted to meet the inference, which is obviously deducible from them, by shewing that they have had a majority of barristers, attorneys, and doctors. In the above list we have not included the 92 freemen whose votes were objected to.

The only mode of removing the names of these freemen from the list of parliamentary electors is by an appeal to a Committee of the House of Commons.* Those honorary freemen who may seek to register, henceforward, should be opposed before the revising barrister. If he should admit their claims, an appeal should be made to a Committee of the House. If he should reject them, the honorary freemen could appeal to the judges, and then the question might be fairly and satisfactorily considered.

The fourth class of objections was against certain voters, who, it was alleged, were in arrear for more than one half year's amount of paving rate. This objection was founded on the oath given in the schedule to the Reform Act, which every voter must take, *if required on behalf of a candidate*, to the effect, among other things, that "not more than one half year's grand jury or municipal cesses, rates, and taxes, are now due and payable by me in respect of the premises in this certificate mentioned." The petitioners contended that by this oath it was implied that the elector who had not paid his rates should be disqualified from voting, though the rates had not been demanded. It is needless to remark how unjust it would be to disfranchise a man for the non-payment of a rate, of the existence of which he might have been ignorant. We will not occupy our readers' time with many arguments on this subject, but merely show the law and practice in analogous cases in England. Scot and lot voters are by the English reform Act left in the same position in which they were before by the common law, except that they are obliged to register. The term (scot and lot voter) according to one of the most approved writers on the law of elections,† "at present, when employed to define a right of election, means *only the payment* by a parishioner of the sum to which he is assessed on the rate."‡ The only qualification of a scot and lot voter is, therefore, the payment of the rates to which he is assessed. By the English Reform Act, the returning officer shall, *if required on behalf of any candidate*, put three questions§ to the voters at the poll, which are similar in substance to the oath in the Irish Act. The third question is, "Have you the same qualification for which your name was originally inserted in the register of voters

* The only objection to this course is that the Liberals could not succeed without opening the registry.

† Rogers, p. 168.

‡ We copy the italics from the original.

§ The first question is as to identity, the second as to whether he has polled before at that election. The oath in the Irish Reform Act is, "I, A. B. do swear, that I am the same whose name appears registered in the certificate or affidavit now produced: and that my qualification as such registered voter still continues: and that I have not before voted at this election: and (*in the cases of householders in cities, towns, and boroughs*) that not more than one half year's, &c." as above.

now in force for the county of, or for the city of, &c.” This question, when put to a scot and lot voter, is an enquiry whether he has paid up all the rates to which he has been assessed; as, to be qualified to register, or to vote, he must have paid up *all* his rates. Yet no committee of any complexion will now strike off such voters, unless it is proved that the rate has been demanded and refused, a subsequent non-payment being held to amount to a refusal. It is now the settled law that a demand must be proved. Thus in English cases, where the payment of the rate assessed is the sole qualification, and where the same question *may* be put, as *may* be put in Irish cases, a demand for the rate must be made before a man can be disqualified for the non-payment: while in the present case, where the rating was only accidental to the qualification,* and where but for the oath the payment of the rates could not be even implied to be a necessary precedent to the exercise of the franchise,† it was sought to disqualify without a demand. The committee decided that a demand was necessary. The petitioners on this gave up the class, which embraced about seventy-five votes. They had previously failed in several cases in this class to prove even non-payment; and in the case in which the committee came to the above resolution, the voter was not in arrear for more than half a year’s rate. The committee of last year held that a demand was not necessary.

It has been determined by two committees during the present session, of one of which Sir Robert Peel was chairman, that an enquiry could not be instituted before them as to the non-payment of rates, if the third question had not been put to the voter at the poll. Arguing from analogy we should conclude that, unless the oath were put to the Irish voters, there could not be any enquiry afterwards on the same subject.—But when can Irishmen expect strict justice?

The sixth class of objections involved the question whether the “rate or rent for the supply of pipe-water” was a municipal rate within the meaning of that word in the Reform Act. The witnesses, who were called by the petitioners, proved, on cross-examination, that the “rate or rent” was payable not prospectively,

* It not being necessary for householders in Ireland to be assessed to any rates or taxes.

† By the fifth section of the Reform Act, £10 householders cannot register if they be in arrears for more than six months’ taxes. But there is no clause in the body of the act requiring that they should pay the rates which become due between the registration and the election. The law is the same with regard to £10 householders as in England. They must have paid up all the rates due before the 6th of April in each year to be entitled to register; but are not required to pay those which become due between the registration and the election.

but in reference to the supply of water antecedently furnished; that there were several parts of the city, in which pipes or mains were not laid down, and that though the corporation had power to lay them down in every street, they could not compel the inhabitants to take the water, or to pay for it if they did not take it. To show the light in which the corporation itself viewed this "rate or rent," we need only refer to the 42 Geo. III, c. 92, the Act under which this "rate or rent" is now collected. The words employed throughout that enactment to express the charge for the supply of pipe-water are, "rates or rents." In the 3d section, the corporation are empowered "to take the following annual rates or rents *for the supply* of pipe-water." By the 4th and 5th sections, they are empowered "to contract and agree with brewers," distillers and others, "for an annual rate or rent for the pipe-water consumed and used by them in their several and respective trades, occupations and manufactures; *such annual rate* to be over and above, and in addition to, the annual rate or rent herein directed to be *paid* for each and every dwelling house." Here they call the price agreed on by the brewers and others "a rate," without adding the word "rent," thus showing that they used it simply in its most ordinary acceptation, (particularly in Ireland) to express a sum fixed and determined. In the 8th section, an agreement entered into between the corporation and the subscribers to the Grand Canal is recited in the following words:—"Resolved, that it be agreed on between the subscribers to the Grand Canal and the City of Dublin, that in consideration of the subscribers supplying the city with such a quantity of water, hereafter to be ascertained, as shall amply supply the several inhabitants thereof, the city shall pay to the subscribers ten per cent. upon the gross produce of the revenue that shall arise to the city *from the sale of the said water*: the payment of the said ten per cent. not to commence till the first day of May one thousand seven hundred and seventy-six," &c. &c. The 10th section provides that, if any one "liable or subject to pay any such annual rate or rent" should neglect or refuse to do so, the corporation should be empowered to "cut or turn off the water, by drawing the ferule or ferules out of the mains or pipes," and to make a distress under a warrant from a justice; and "if such annual rate or rent *so due and owing*" should not be paid within five days, to sell the goods so distrained. The committee held that this was not a municipal tax. On this decision, which affected about eighty-five votes, being announced, the petitioners withdrew from the contest. The committee of last year decided that the pipe-water "rate or rent" was a municipal tax. This question, and that as to the necessity of demanding the rate, were the only two, on which the late committee

differed from the former. The propriety of the late decisions has not, we believe, been questioned by any lawyer of eminence at either bar.

Let those, who have been accustomed to the vauntings of the Tory party as to the certainty of their success on this petition, and who have perhaps read that document in which they charged the Liberal candidates with treating, bribery, corruption, the illegal influencing of voters through the officers and dependents of the Crown, and "the most flagrant acts of intimidation," consider that when the time for investigating these charges had arrived, there was not a syllable said about them. Let them then look at the five subjects which were thought worthy of being brought before the notice of the committee. There they will find in the two first classes, on which the petitioners must have principally relied, 666 voters objected to on mere verbal quibbles; in the third class, ninety-two sought to be placed on the poll, who had no imaginable right to the exercise of the franchise; in the fourth, seventy-five sought to be struck off for not having paid a rate, which had never been asked of them, and of the existence of which they might have been ignorant; and in the fifth, eighty-five for not paying a private debt, for "rent," between them and a company that supplied them with water.

We now come to those cases in which the petitioners obtained majorities of Tories on the committees. These were the Belfast, Youghal, Kinsale, Waterford, and Westmeath. The conduct pursued by these should be a warning to the Reformers of the kingdom, and should be for ever a proof of the accuracy of judgment with which the Spottiswoode "gang" calculated on the moral feelings and *political bias* of the Conservative members of the legislature. That the members of those Tory committees had feelings somewhat sympathetic and congenial with those of the Spottiswoode committee on the subject of Irish elections, and the amount of justice which should be meted out to the "aliens," is what the proceedings before them force us irresistibly to believe. It was a remarkable feature in those tribunals, that while they saw their own friends succeeding by the ordinary course of affairs, they observed a most decorous regard for impartiality. But when they perceived them in a strait, or that matters had reached such a crisis that the farther extension of fair play would endanger the issue, it was then they became impervious to argument, and showed how well they deserved the generous confidence of the Spottiswoode confederators. We beg leave, however, to do the Belfast committee the justice of saying that *they* exhibited no symptoms of this contemptible hypocrisy, and that they did not leave it in the power of their most malignant enemies to hint that they were not a true and genuine specimen of

the real Tory committee. It was on the obtaining of such committees that the Spottiswoode "gang" had calculated, according to the experience of preceding sessions. Had they obtained them, how delightful to Tories would have been the result!

This committee, consisting of ten Tories and one Liberal, exhibited from the very outset its "political bias," by deciding even the most trifling question in favour of the petitioners. They opened the registry by instinct; as, after they had heard the counsel for the sitting member argue against their power to do so, when the counsel for the petitioners rose, they told him, before he had delivered a sentence, that he need not proceed, as they were satisfied that they had the power to open the registry. They received certain Police Valuation books in corroborative evidence of the value of some voters' houses, without a tittle of evidence to explain on what principle the valuation had been made; whether on the rack-rental, or only on a certain proportion of the rack-rental. The petitioners had three of the valuers in attendance, unknown to the opposite party; but aware of the nature of their evidence, and of the *bias* of the committee, they did not produce them. After they had been giving those books in evidence for some days, they called one of the valuers to speak on another subject. In his cross-examination he said, that the valuations of the houses in the Police books were made only from external appearance, as the valuers were not authorized to enter the houses; and that they were moreover in the habit of allowing the tenant the benefit of a reduction of one or two pounds on a house worth £10. The committee struck off the names of several voters in cases in which the petitioners' witnesses swore that the houses were worth *no more* than £9 or £9. 9s. and other witnesses, equally respectable, swore that they were fully worth £10, and more.*

To enumerate all the judicial enormities of this committee, would occupy more space than we can allot to them; but we cannot pass by, without notice, the decisions on the respective qualifications of Mr. Gibson and Mr. Emerson Tennent.

* It would appear (see *Morning Chronicle*, July 14th) that 13 of the Votes struck off by this Committee, have been re-registered without any opposition—"Let us take a sample of those cases. *The vote of a person named M'Avoy was struck off in London for want of value.* One of the witnesses produced against the voter said, "I collected the rent; he (M'Avoy) paid me £9; in my opinion, it is above the rent; £7 10s. or £8 is full value—rather a high rent." Another witness testified as follows: "Value £8 per annum." And another: "I thing the utmost value would be from £8 to £8 8s." Such was the London testimony; and, of course, the committee would pay no attention to any rebutting evidence. Well, the witnesses who testified as above were surely produced at the registry!! *Not one of them, although M'Avoy called upon the Tory agent to produce them, if he durst! He submitted his receipts for the payment of rent, which showed that he paid at the rate of fifteen guineas a-year, instead of £9. He is rated in the police books for £10, and the ground alone on which his house is built would bring £10 a year.*"

By the 9th Anne, c. 5, sec. 1, no person can sit in the House of Commons for a borough, "who shall not have an estate, freehold or copyhold, for his own life, or some greater estate in law or equity," to the amount of £300 a-year above reprises. Mr. Gibson's qualification arose out of certain lands to the value of £150 a-year, held on a lease for three lives, renewable for ever, among which was his own life; and of certain other lands, of the value of £278. 15s. 4½d. held on the same sort of tenure, but that his own life was not one of those mentioned in the lease.* The value of the property was admitted, and also, that the first-mentioned tenure was such as would qualify, if sufficient in amount. But it was contended that, as Mr. Gibson's own life was not one of those mentioned in the lease on which the other lands were held; these were not "an estate for his own life, or some greater estate." The covenant on which this property depended, was to the effect, that Mr. Gibson should hold the lands for the three lives named in the lease, and *during such farther and other life, and lives, as should for ever thereafter be added thereunto, pursuant to the covenants therein contained.* It has been always allowed, that such lease conveyed a freehold estate, not only for the lives therein mentioned, but for ever, as the lessees could insert fresh lives, according as the subsisting ones dropped. In the present case, there were reciprocal clauses compelling Mr. Gibson to accept the renewal at the rents and covenants agreed on, and the lessor to grant it on the same conditions. If any of the lives should fall before Mr. Gibson, he could at once insert his own life, and then there would be no objection to his qualification. But we will not inflict a treatise on the law of leases for lives renewable for ever on our readers; and shall, therefore, merely say, that it was admitted on all hands—no lawyer could dispute it—that so long as Mr. Gibson paid the rents, and performed the covenants agreed on in the lease, no power could deprive him of the property to the end of time; and that it was, while the conditions were performed, a freehold estate in perpetuity as indefeasible as any in the kingdom. But the committee decided, that this was not an estate for Mr. Gibson's own life; on the presumption, we suppose, that he would refuse to perform the conditions which secured him an independence.

The committee then struck off between sixty and seventy votes which had been given for Mr. Gibson on the two last days of the election, though there was no proof offered that any one of these

* Mr. Gibson held different other properties on ordinary leases for lives and terms of years, to which we have not above alluded, as they were not of a nature to qualify under the statute.

voters had received notice of that gentleman's alleged want of qualification.

The particulars of Mr. Emerson Tennent's qualification, were delivered in on the 20th December, 1837. The election took place in August. He claimed to qualify out of estates in Fermanagh and Sligo, of the annual value of £1,066. 17s. 6d. The following are the facts respecting this property, as detailed before the committee. Mrs. Tennent was declared heiress-at-law in 1834 by the Court of Chancery, to all her father's real property, consisting of the above-mentioned estates, subject to trust-settlements made by her father. By one of these he had secured to her an annuity of £200 a-year, for her sole and separate use, and not to be subject to the controul or debts of her husband; and to be payable to her children for ever—or to her father's heirs, if she should leave no issue. By the other settlement, he secured an annuity of £100 to another daughter, now Mrs. Thompson Tennent, on the same conditions. These settlements affected the Fermanagh property only. The Court of Chancery, at the time of declaring her heiress-at-law, appointed a receiver to pay into court the rent, amounting to £91. 14s. 9d., of two sub-divisions of this property, called Ballinamona and Cairns, to form a fund for the compensation of disappointed devisees, under a will of Mrs. E. Tennent's father, which it had set aside. Mrs. E. Tennent afterwards conveyed the lands in fee to her husband.

It appeared by the evidence, that the annual rental payable to Mr. Emerson Tennent out of the Fermanagh property, up to November last, was only £351. subject to the above annuities; and that the rental of the Sligo property to the same date, was only £453. 8s. 6d., subject also to the payment of £376. 8s. 6d., the interest at $4\frac{1}{2}$ per cent., on a mortgage debt of £8360. Adding these several sums, we find that Mr. E. Tennent's income, "clear above reprises," was, at the time when, as the committee reported, he "was duly elected, and ought to have been returned" as follows:—

Fermanagh estates	.	£351	0	0	
Annuity to Mrs. E. Tennent	£200				
----- Mrs. Thompson					
Tennent	.	100			
		-----	300	0	0
Clear income	.				51 0 0
Sligo estates	.		453	8	6
Interest on mortgage	.		376	8	6
			-----	-----	
Clear income	.				77 0 0

Total income	.				£128 0 0

Such being his income at the time of the election, and up to the 20th of December, we shall call attention to the words of the statute, to which we have alluded. After providing that the representative shall have a freehold or copyhold estate, in law or equity, of the annual value of £300 (for a borough) above reprises for his own use and benefit, it enacts, “that if any person who shall be elected or returned to serve in Parliament as a knight, &c. &c. shall not, *at the time of such election and return*, be seized of or entitled to such an estate in lands, tenements, and hereditaments, as for such knight, or citizen, burgess, or baron respectively, is hereinbefore required or limited, *such election and return shall be void.*”

The committee did not deem themselves bound by these provisions, and therefore took into consideration what was stated to be the value long after “*the time of such election and return.*” The facts relied on for Mr. Tennent, were as follows:—On the 5th January last, he executed a lease of two townlands of the Fermanagh estate, which were then held by some tenants under *unexpired leases for lives* at £112 a-year, to Mr. Adams, his *agent*, and the receiver of the property, at the rent of £200 a-year, from the 1st of November, 1837. Mr. Adams got possession of only seventeen acres. Part of the Sligo estate had also been let at an increased rent, some time previous to the assembling of the committee, by *a letter* from Mr. E. Tennent in answer to a proposal. Neither document was produced, and the former tenants were still in possession. The petitioners also went into a mass of evidence, to show what those lands *would be worth** if the present leases had expired; and thus, they made out the following result:—

				£	s.	d.
Fermanagh estate under Adams's lease,	.	.	.	507	9	11
Sligo estate, (<i>value</i> and new lettings)	.	.	.	559	17	7
				<hr/>		
Deduct	.	.	.	1,066	17	6
Annuity to Mrs. E. Tennent	£200	0	0			
———— Mrs. T. Tennent	100	0	0			
Interest on mortgage	376	8	6	676	8	6
				<hr/>		
Clear income	.	.	.	£390	9	0

Unfortunately, however, while the committee were deliberating, they called in Mr. Adams, in the absence of counsel and agents, and he informed them, that Ballinamona and Cairns were included in the Fermanagh property. Consequently, as that rent

* The value of the lands above the rent belonged to the Lessees and not to Mr. Tennent, since they held for unexpired lives which he might not survive; he could not therefore avail himself of this contingent future interest to increase his present rental.

(£91. 14s. 9d.) was paid into Chancery, it should be deducted out of the above calculation. This would leave Mr. Tennent, on his own showing, an income of only £298. 14s. 3d. The committee decided, that he "is duly qualified." We need scarcely add, that they returned the two Conservative candidates.

In the Youghal case, the committee consisted of six Tories and five Liberals. They exhibited a greater degree of impartiality and of respect for the forms at least of justice, than any other Tory (Irish) committee of the session. They, of course, opened the registry. On the question of the freemen, they also decided as Tories should. It was proved, that before the Reform Act, no one was admitted to the freedom, by any right of birth, marriage or service, but that since that time, the corporation was in the habit of admitting them on these fictitious grounds, lest they should come under the denomination of honorary freemen. The committee overcame the difficulty by a rather queer resolution,—“that persons admitted to the freedom of the Borough of Youghal by right of birth, marriage, or service, were not honorary freemen, and were consequently entitled to vote.” Thus they avoided the real question as to whether any one was admitted by right of birth, marriage or service, and gained their real object—to keep the freemen on the poll. In this decorous manner they were proceeding, slowly but surely, to return Mr. Nichol for that borough, till at length, having struck off two freemen, (one, who had been admitted as the eldest son of a freeman, on proof that he was not the eldest son; the other, who had been admitted on the like ground, on proof that many years before his admission, his father had resigned his freedom by deed) these two decisions were regarded as so fatal to the petitioner's case, that the counsel immediately afterwards informed the committee, that in consequence of the decisions as to the rights of those freemen, they had been instructed to retire from the contest.

Into a minute detail of the proceedings before the Kinsale committee,* it would be useless to enter. To convey some idea of their mode of administering justice, we will give the particulars of two cases, and the decisions arrived at by those infallible arbiters of “the noblest birthright of a British subject,” whose rectitude of intention it would be *reprimandable* to question.

Edward Bishop was objected to by the counsel for the sitting, member on the ground, that he did not hold or occupy any premises to entitle him to register or vote. It appeared, that the house out of which he registered, had been held by his father on a lease for ninety-nine years, provided three lives should so long live, renewable, on the failure of a life, for ninety-nine years, if the

* Seven Tories and 4 Liberals.

three then subsisting lives should so long live. The father of the voter died intestate on the 12th of June, 1832, leaving a widow, a son (the voter,) and two daughters. On the 26th October following, the voter registered, the affidavit of registry stating that he had been for four months in possession and occupation of a house, which had come to him by succession on the death of his father. He did not take out letters of administration before the 7th of April, 1835. The house was worth £30. but was not worth £40 a year.

It was not, it could not be denied, that the voter was wrong in claiming this house by succession, as it was a chattel, not a freehold property, being held for a term of years, dependent on certain contingencies. He therefore had no title to register as heir. Neither had he a title to register in any other character in 1832, as he did not administer till 1835. On these grounds he was clearly disqualified as to title. Then as to value; to one-third of the value of the house his mother was entitled. The remaining two-thirds were divisible between him and his two sisters. This would not leave each of them £9 a year; consequently on no ground had he the least title to the exercise of the franchise. At the period of the proceedings, when this vote was under consideration, the general case between the sitting member and his Conservative opponent had reached that critical position, at which fair-play would endanger the success of the latter. Was it on that account that the committee resolved, "that the vote be allowed"? We heard it whispered—but of course we cannot vouch for it—that the ground on which the vote was decided, was that it was absurd to suppose, that so good a house should give no vote to any one; and therefore as the mother and sister *could* not vote, it was to be *presumed* that they had *assigned* their interests to the only male in the family. It is needless to say there was no evidence of any such assignment.

William Warren was objected to by the counsel for the sitting member, on the ground that he had been admitted an honorary freeman after the 30th March, 1831,—and that he was therefore debarred from the exercise of the parliamentary franchise, by the proviso in the ninth section of the Reform Act.

To prevent doubts as to the obvious violation of justice committed in this case, we lay before our readers the entire of the ninth section :

" Provided always and be it enacted, That all freemen, freeholders, and persons who by reason of any corporate or other right, are now by law entitled to vote at the election of a member or members to serve in Parliament for any city, town or borough, and all persons, who by

reason of birth, marriage or service, or of any statute now in force, shall be at any time hereafter admitted to their freedom in any city, town or borough, sending a member or members to Parliament, shall after such registration as is directed by this Act, but so long only as they shall reside within the said city, town or borough, or within seven statute miles of the usual place of election therein, have and enjoy such right of voting as fully and in like manner, as if this Act had not been passed. Provided farther, That no persons, who since the thirtieth day of March, in the year of our Lord one thousand eight hundred and thirty-one, have been, or shall hereafter be, admitted as honorary freemen, shall be entitled by virtue of such admission to vote or register as freemen under this Act."

The case against Warren was as follows: It was proved by the nature of the charter, and by the evidence of the officers of the corporation of Kinsale, that in that borough, no person had a right to be admitted a freeman, "by reason of birth, marriage or service, or of any statute now in force," but that admissions were granted solely by the will and favour of the corporation. Warren and all the other freemen of the borough were consequently of that class, which are designated, in the proviso, honorary freemen; as distinguished from those who obtain their freedom by "reason of birth, marriage or service, or of some statute now in force." At a council held on the 13th of August 1824,—“it was ordered that he, William Warren, Esq.,” with several others “all of the town of Kinsale, shall be admitted and sworn freemen at the next or any future court of D'Oyer Hundred, to be held for the same, at which they shall appear.” He was not “*admitted*” a freeman by this order of council,—it merely gave him a right to be admitted at any future court, at which he should appear. This right he retained for seven years only, as after that period he could not, by the 33 Geo. III. c. 38, sue out a writ to enforce his admission. The seven years for enforcing his right expired on the 12th of August 1831. After that day, he had ceased to have a right of admission by virtue of the order in council of 1824,—and he never had a right of admission “by reason of birth, marriage or service, or of some statute.” It was not before the 12th of September 1832, that he appeared at the Court of D'Oyer Hundred, and was admitted and sworn a freeman. He was therefore, in all respects admitted as an honorary freeman after the 30th of March 1831, and was consequently disqualified from voting. This conclusion was so obvious, or rather inevitable, that there was not a body of men in the kingdom, who could evade it, and come to the resolution, “that the vote of William Warren be allowed,” except the Tory majority of an election committee, under the influence of some extravagant delusion, or of ——— *political bias*.

On the discussion of this vote, it appeared that the twelve judges in Ireland had decided this very question against the vote, overruling the decision of the revising barrister, which had been in its favour. An application to have this question reargued was made on the following day, by reason of its importance to the parties, and as a decision in the very teeth of that of the twelve judges ; but it was rejected : for preposterous, indeed, was it to expect, that the committee could afford to reconsider such a question, or to give way to any authority whatever, at such a critical conjuncture of the proceedings, when even one case decided fairly by inadvertence, might deprive them of the object of all their labours—the return of their own political partisan. The counsel for the sitting member finding their arguments unavailing, gave up the contest, and allowed Colonel Henry Thomas to take his seat for Kinsale, as the representative of his congenial Tory committee.

The Waterford committee, consisting of eight Tories and three Liberals, differed so widely from the Newry, that it allowed the petitioner to proceed with the examination of a witness on the charge against the sitting member, without producing even an authenticated list of the voters, much less an affidavit or certificate. Finding, however, that the witness stated that he had polled on a particular day, they reconsidered the question, and determined that the poll-books, at least, should be produced. The poll-books, on being produced, not appearing to have been properly authenticated, the committee adjourned for some days, to send for the officer who should have authenticated them. The only point relied on against the sitting member, was a charge of bribery and corruption. This was as beautifully fabricated a story as could have been desired. Mr. Barron was accused of having induced a Protestant elector to vote “against his own Church,” by “divers sums of money, and other gifts and rewards.” A priest was, of course, introduced into the tale. He was present when the promises of money were made, when the poor Protestant voter polled “against his own Church,” and when some of the money was afterwards paid, in part performance of this nefarious contract. We believe that few of our readers will doubt but that the priest was introduced as often as he ought to be, in order to give a real interest and gusto to the fiction. Had the witnesses been sufficiently conscience-hardened, the charge would have been satisfactorily proved, and three objects, at least, would be gained : a Tory would replace a Liberal ; the latter would be convicted of having practised those arts of corruption which he had repeatedly denounced ; and a priest—a priest !—would be exhibited as the abettor, or rather the pro-

moter, of his iniquity. The first and second witnesses went through their parts so well, that the committee seemed perfectly satisfied of the guilt of the accused;—but the third was forced to confess, in the course of his cross-examination, that he was to get £40 “*if he should prove the charge against Mr. Barron;*” that the first witness was to receive something between £20 and £30; and that the second was also to be paid he knew not how much. We need hardly say, that the charge against Mr. Barron was instantly abandoned.

In the Westmeath case, the majorities proposed to be cut down are actually more than double the entire numbers polled for the Tory candidate. The latter never expected to succeed in being returned, but merely to overwhelm their opponents with the costs of a protracted inquiry, if they should get a Tory committee. The complexion of the committee which they have got will not damp their anticipations. It opened the registry. It refused a commission to hear the evidence in this country. After the lapse of ten days, finding that it had not disposed of more than two cases, the first of which it had been obliged to decide against the petitioners, it became alarmed for the loss of its own time,—not being paid for attendance,—and hastily granted a commission, the suggestion having first come from one of its own members. Of the words “beneficial value,” as used in the Irish Reform Act with regard to voters in counties, there have been two interpretations; one favourable, the other adverse, to the extension of the franchise. It, of course, adopted the latter.*

* The following is the decision of the committee:—“Resolved, That the value of the qualification which entitles a party to register and to vote as a freeholder in a county at large in Ireland, under the 2 and 3 William IV, c. 88, is the same as was prescribed in the case of a freeholder in the 10 Geo. IV, c. 8; and, therefore, that the criterion of value is what a solvent and responsible tenant can fairly, and without collusion, afford to give as an additional rent, over and above the rent and charges payable in respect of such qualifications.” The 10 Geo. IV, c. 8, commences with disfranchising the forty-shilling freeholders, and repealing some acts relating to them; and then provides, that “Whereas it is expedient to increase the amount of qualification necessary to entitle persons to vote at” elections for counties at large, no person should be entitled to vote, unless he should “have an estate of freehold, in lands, tenements, and hereditaments, in such county, of the clear yearly value of £10, at the least, over and above all rents and charges, except only public or parliamentary taxes, county, Church, or parish cesses or rates, and cesses on any townland, or division of any parish or barony.” Contrast with this the Reform Act. “Whereas it is expedient to extend the elective franchise to many of His Majesty’s subjects in Ireland who have not heretofore enjoyed the same, to increase the number of representatives, &c., and to diminish the expenses of elections therein, Be it enacted, by and with, &c., that, in addition to the persons now by law qualified to vote at the elections of knights of the shire, &c., every male person of full age, &c., who shall be entitled, either as lessee or assignee, to any lands or tenements, whether freehold or of any other tenure whatever, for the unexpired residue, &c. &c., and have a *beneficial interest* therein, of the clear yearly value of not less than £10, over and above all rents and charges, &c. shall be entitled,” &c. &c. Can any one fail to see that

What it will do on the return of the commission, we will not attempt to anticipate.

This closes the list of the Spottiswoode election petitions. The result appears briefly thus:—of the cases brought before committees, the Liberals failed in two, the Conservatives in nine; the former succeeded in one, the latter in two; the former gained one seat, the latter gained three.

We confess we feel rather sanguine as to the moral effect of the general result of these petitions on the feelings of the British nation. Englishmen will see in these petitions, and their fate, a shadowing of that system of misrepresentation by which their prejudices against Irishmen have been hitherto kept alive. They will recollect, that during all last autumn and winter they were continually excited by the tales of the atrocities committed at the Irish elections; and that they were solemnly assured, that the great majority of the Liberal members had secured their returns by every species of intimidation, corruption, and personation of voters, by the illegal influence of the officers of the crown, and the spiritual despotism of the priests. Englishmen will not forget, that it was on the supposed truth of these charges they were induced to contribute to the *Sacred Fund*: but when the time for investigating them had arrived, they find them all to be the fictions of a gang of political and professional adventurers, who contrived to swindle them out of their money on these false and fraudulent pretences. They find all the tales that excited their indignation, to be—lies, and the only one submitted to investigation (and that for very shame's sake), to be a lie, aggravated by subornation of perjury.

Regarding this gang as but a minute section of the Tory party, acting for a limited period, and on a small scale, they will begin to see, that as it misrepresented and swindled for a season, so had the entire faction for centuries. They will learn to estimate the truth of those charges, by which they have been induced for ages to bestow their treasures on that faction that has ever misrepre-

the words "beneficial interest" were added to the "clear yearly value" of the former statute, for the purpose of enlarging the sense in which these had been interpreted? As the Reform Act confers the franchise on species of tenures that had never before enjoyed it; so it also, in some degree, qualifies the amount required by the former enactment. "Beneficial interest" obviously means, such an interest as consists of the conveniences, the advantages, the uses, the profits, the *benefits*, which a man derives, in every way, from the possession of a farm. We may farther observe, that it is commonly thought that a freeholder must have a clear interest of £10, above all charges. But it is sufficient if he have such an interest as, combined with the amount of cesses, rates, and taxes, of all kinds, will make up the sum of £10. As, for instance, if the cesses, rates, and taxes, amount to £3, and if he have above them a clear interest of £7, that is a sufficient qualification. See 10th section of the Reform Act.

sented Ireland, that it might be at liberty to oppress and degrade her. They will learn to divest themselves of their prejudices against our country, and to try her, at least, before they condemn her. As Irishmen, we desire no more, knowing that there never has been a Tory imputation against her, which, when, like the Spottiswoode fictions, it comes to be investigated, will not be found to be a falsehood.

ART. VII.—1. *The Life of Wallenstein, Duke of Friedland.* By Lieutenant-Colonel J. Mitchell. London. 1837.

2. *Geschichte des dreissigjæhrigen Krieges*, von Schiller. (*History of the Thirty Years' War*, by Schiller.)

3. *Geschichte des dreissigjæhrigen Krieges in Deutschland*, von K. A. Menzel. Breslau. 1835, 1837-8. (*History of the Thirty Years' War in Germany*, by K. A. Menzel.)

4. *Albrechts von Wallenstein des Herzog von Friedland und Mecklenburg ungedruckte, eigenhændige Briefe* herausgegeben von F. Fœrster. Berlin. 1828, 1829. (*Autograph and inedited Letters of Albert de Wallenstein, Duke of Friedland and Mecklenbourg*, published by F. Fœrster, Berlin.)

5. *Ungedruckte Briefe Albrecht von Wallenstein, und Gustav Adolphs*, herausgegeben von E. G. Zober. Stralsund. 1830. (*Inedited Letters of Albert de Wallenstein, and of Gustavus Adolphus*, published by E. G. Zober.)

6. *Wallenstein, Herzog zu Mecklenburg, Friedland und Sägan als Feldherr und Landesfürst.* Eine Biographie von Dr. F. Fœrster. Potsdam. 1834. (*Wallenstein, Duke of Mecklenbourg, Friedland and Sagan, as a General and Sovereign.* A Biography by Dr. F. Fœrster.)

7. *De Alberto Waldsteinio, Friedlandiæ Duce proditore.* Commentatio scripsit Rich. Roepell. Halæ. 1834.

THE German empire, which, during many ages, was at the head of the Christian states of Europe, was peculiarly adapted, by its political constitution, to become the arena for that great struggle which was about to take place at the beginning of the sixteenth century. The feudal system had taken too deep root in that country, and received too much support from its elective constitution, to yield to the efforts of such of its emperors as had sought to establish an absolute and hereditary monarchy. Nevertheless, the feudal constitution of the empire had undergone great modifications, and was become a kind of confederation of states, almost independent, and as yet only nominally recog-

nizing the authority of the emperor. These states were composed, in the first place, of the lay principalities, then of the archbishoprics, bishoprics, and abbeys; and, finally, of the free towns. In many provinces, however, especially in Swabia and Franconia, the second order of nobility, called knights of the empire, still preserved their independence; but to maintain it, they were involved in constant struggles,—on the one hand, with the ecclesiastical and lay princes,—on the other, with the free towns, in whose territories their castles were often situated. The princes, in their turn, found their power checked by the numerous ecclesiastical estates, which still enjoyed the ancient privilege of immunity, and which owned no superior except in a final appeal to the emperors; but to them was allowed no other power than what they derived from the immediate possessions which they held before their election to the throne, and in which they were more or less absolute.

Such was the state of Germany when Luther commenced his attack upon the Catholic Church, by objecting, in the first instance, to some of its dogmas, and afterwards by protesting openly against its whole external constitution. It was this protestation which obtained so favourable a reception in Germany for the doctrines he professed, and which he had borrowed from preceding heretics,—Huss and Wickliff, the Albigenses, and Vaudois. All that remained of spiritual power, the princes of the empire sought to destroy, in order to consolidate their own strength. The lay nobility were tempted by the wealth of the Church; and the relaxation of all religious obligations rapidly multiplied the partisans of the new doctrine. In many countries, as in England, the dogmas of the Church were not at first interfered with; and in Sweden, the people believed themselves to be Catholics for half a century after the introduction of Protestantism.*

It is therefore a mistake to consider the publication of indulgences, and the abuses to which this practice had sometimes given occasion, as having caused the birth and rapid progress of the heresies of the sixteenth century. It is no less an error than it would be to maintain that the tax on tea was the true and only cause of American independence. Another cause has been assigned for the commencement of the Reformation, and is remarked upon as such by the author of the first work in the list at the head of this article,—the great progress, namely, of instruction, and the mass of science which learned laymen began at this period to acquire, and of which, until now, the clergy had been the sole depositories. It has even been added, that the Catholic

* Gejer Geschichte von Schweden, Hamburg, 1834, t. ii. p. 218.

Church made every exertion to stop the diffusion of knowledge ; but these assertions are most distinctly disproved by the acknowledged facts ; for it was Pope Leo X who took under his especial protection that classical literature which was reprobated by so many of the regular clergy, who, not without reason, considered it dangerous, as containing and spreading the principles of paganism.* The same Pope was the first to cause the Hebrew text of the Holy Scriptures to be printed ; and he encouraged the learned Erasmus to publish a Greek edition of the New Testament, with a Latin translation and notes.† In fact, the court of Rome was the true centre of the impulse given to literature and science, and Leo X unhappily incurred many reproaches, by occupying himself more with arts and letters than with the affairs of the Church. While doctrinal questions were discussed by theologians alone, the princes of the empire, the nobles of the second class, and the towns which were anxious to escape from the spiritual authority of the bishops, began to reform the Church after their own method. They suppressed the convents and rich abbeys, seized upon their wealth, and confiscated that of a multitude of pious foundations ; they diminished the number of secular priests,—declared war against the prince-bishops,—and refused thenceforward to recognize their authority either in temporal or spiritual matters.‡ These acts were so many attacks upon the constitution of the empire,—so many violations of public peace,—and so many encroachments upon the rights of the emperor, as supreme head of the state, and suzerain of all the lay and ecclesiastical vassals in the empire. Luther himself greatly encouraged these acts of violence, by his letter addressed “ To the Christian Nobility of Germany,” in which he attacked the whole external constitution of the Catholic Church, and invited the nobles to seize upon all ecclesiastical property, “ with the exception, however, of such foundations as were intended to offer a respectable position in society to the younger branches of the nobility.”§ Some time afterwards he openly recognised in temporal princes,

* K. A. Menzel, *Neuere Geschichte der Deutschen von der Reformation bis zur Brundesarte*, Breslau, 1836, t. i. p. 19. The work, which is the third mentioned at the head of the article, is a continuation of the above.

† Menzel, *ibid.* p. 7.

‡ We take this opportunity of recommending to our readers two excellent works, lately published at Vienna, upon the history of the Reformation, one by Ferdinand Buckhals, entitled *History of Ferdinand I*, Vienna, 1832-37, 9 vol. 8vo.; and the other by K. A. Menzel, from which we have quoted. The author of the first-named work is a Catholic, highly distinguished by his learning.

§ M. Leo, himself a Protestant, and professor of history to the University of Halle, has clearly pointed out the culpable perfidy of this letter, *Vid. Lehrbuch der Universalgeschichte*, Halle, 1838, t. iii. p. 92-96.

a supreme jurisdiction over spiritual matters, and thus completed the establishment of absolute monarchies. The great majority of the people, however, retained their affection for Catholicism; and the new religion was, in many instances, forced upon them by violence or fraud. A gradual change was made in doctrine and in worship by those Catholic priests that embraced the new opinions, or by the Protestant ministers who took the place of such as continued to oppose them; but in many countries the people rose and offered the strongest opposition to this alteration.

By virtue of the ancient laws of the empire, the emperor, Charles V, had declared a public ban against Luther, as an obstinate heretic; but he was by no means anxious to carry the sentence into execution. After the Diet of Worms, assembled in 1521, he returned to Spain, and the war he was carrying on in Italy against Francis I, left him no time to interfere in the affairs of the empire. At length, after an absence of seven years, he returned to Germany, and used every effort to re-establish religious unity by gentle means. He requested the propagators of the new opinions to embody their profession of faith, which he received in a diet convoked by him at Augsburg in 1530. By order of the emperor, Catholic theologians wrote a refutation of the *Confession of Augsburg*; but all attempts to bring back the Protestant princes to the Catholic Church were unavailing. Finding that they were in a minority at the diet, they retired from it, and concluded between themselves the celebrated *Confederation of Schmalkald*, by which they constituted themselves a political body. This act of open opposition to the emperor's authority, was the real beginning of those religious wars which destroyed the prosperity of Germany, and prepared its dissolution. The confederates "undertook to defend each other mutually against any party which should attack them on account of their religion; that none of them should conclude a truce or a peace with their enemies, without the consent of the others; and that all who embraced the new religion should, if they wished it, be received into the confederation."*

Luther himself approved of the Protestants taking arms against the emperor, and declared that it was not an act of rebellion, but of self-defence.† With this, however, the confederates were not satisfied; for they addressed themselves to the kings of France and England, and demanded their aid against the emperor.

* Hortleder Handlungen und Ausschreiben von den Ursachen des Deutschen Krieges, Frank. 1617, t. i. p. 1501.

† Luther, in the letter entitled "A Warning to my dear Germans." Works of Luther, edit. Walch. t. xvi. p. 1950-2062.

Charles was still desirous to use the utmost moderation ; and to avoid a civil war he entered into negotiations with the Protestant princes, and came to a sort of compromise with them at Nuremburg (1532), by which the final settlement of all religious differences was postponed to a general council or to a new diet. But on every occasion the Protestants persisted in opposing the decisions of the majority in the diets ; they refused to furnish their proportion to the army which the emperor had raised to fight against the Turks ; appealed from the jurisdiction of the high court of justice of the empire, established in the reign of Maximilian I ; and renewed their alliance with the kings of England and France. At length they took up arms against Duke Henry of Brunswick, one of the most zealous of the Catholic princes, and who was at that time at war with the Protestant inhabitants of the town of Gosslar. They drove him from his duchy—introduced Protestantism throughout the country—and appointed magistrates to maintain it. But even this flagrant violation of the rights of a prince of the empire, could not overcome the emperor's desire of peace ; nor was he tempted to more ambitious plans, by his victories over the French in Italy, or by finding himself at the head of a powerful army of Italians and Spaniards, which would have enabled him at once to subdue his enemies. He took a different course. In a diet assembled at Spires in 1544, he endeavoured, by concession, to gain the Protestant party. He gave no decision upon the affairs of Brunswick ; but granted to the Protestants a new delay, for the settlement of religious differences, which were to be terminated in the general council, that, at the reiterated request of the emperor,* the Pope had promised to convoke.

Charles still hoped to re-establish religious unity ; and to effect this purpose he caused theological discussions to be held betwixt the most eminent professors of the two religions ; but all attempts were fruitless. At length the general council, which the Protestants had so earnestly demanded, was convoked, and opened at Trent in 1545 ; and the emperor invited the Protestant states to send deputies to it. This invitation under different pretexts they refused to accept, thus closing the door upon the last chance of reconciliation with the Catholic Church. They were, in fact, determined not to give up, or alter their opinions, and the emperor became convinced of this at the Diet of Ratisbon, which he convoked in 1546. The principal Protestant leaders refused to appear at it, and such as were present

* Leo admits that this decision of the diet contained all the concessions that could be expected from the emperor. *Handbuch der Universalgeschichte*, t. iii. p. 170.

protested, in the name of the rest, against the acts of the council; the members of the confederation of Schmalkald taking the lead in this resistance to the power of the emperor.

The war of Schmalkald, the first of a long series of religious wars in Germany, arose from political rather than religious grounds. The emperor was obliged to take up arms to prevent his own authority, and that of the general diets of the empire, from being trampled on; and this motive was so decidedly political, that the duke of Saxony, although himself a Protestant, did not hesitate to accept the command of the army with which the emperor was to oppose the members of the confederation of Schmalkald. This war was terminated by a victory gained by the Imperial arms over John Frederick, the electoral prince of Saxony, at Mühlberg. This prince fell into the hands of the conqueror, as did also the landgrave Philip of Hesse.

The Protestant confederation was dissolved, and its members submitted to the emperor, who invested duke Maurice with the electorate of Saxony, of which John Albert was deprived. One town alone still braved his power; the most ardent Protestant leaders, such as Flacrius, Amsdorf, and others, had shut themselves up in Magdeburg, and encouraged the inhabitants to disobey his commands. This town was placed under the ban of the empire, and the execution of the sentence entrusted to the Elector Maurice. A new epoch for Protestantism began with the siege of Magdeburg (1550-1551). Duke Maurice had not sincerely attached himself to the emperor; his alliance with Charles arose not from a sense of duty, but from a view to his personal interest—his cousin, the electoral prince John, had offended him, and the desire of revenge, and the hope of increasing his power, were the true motives of his conduct. After he had been invested with the electorate, he began to fear the Imperial authority, which he had himself re-established; he wished, moreover, to escape from the promise he had made to the emperor, of conforming to the decrees of the council of Trent, and he availed himself of his position, as generalissimo of the imperial troops, to raise the standard of rebellion. After having concluded an alliance with Henry II, king of France, to whom he gave up the three free towns of the empire, Metz, Toul, and Verdun, he took Magdeburg; ratified to the inhabitants their privileges, and marched against Inspruck in the Tyrol, where the emperor lay sick and without troops. Wholly unable to offer any resistance to the friend who betrayed him, Charles negotiated with the rebel, and concluded with him, through the intervention of his brother Ferdinand of Austria, a truce at Passau, which was afterwards confirmed by the religious peace, called the Peace of

Augsburg (1555). This peace may be said to have completed the Reformation in Germany, and the arrangements made at the Diet of Augsburg, may be considered as the basis of the political existence of the Protestant states of the empire. The following are some of its principal articles:—"The different states professing the two religions shall henceforward enjoy perfect liberty of worship, and an entire equality of political rights. Wherever the Protestant religion is established it shall remain, *and each prince shall have a right to introduce it into his states.* Such Catholic princes as will not grant liberty of conscience to their Protestant subjects, shall allow them to emigrate; the appropriation of ecclesiastical property to secular purposes by Protestant princes shall be maintained." To these large concessions to the Protestants, the Catholics added a clause stipulating, "That every bishop or ecclesiastic owing a direct allegiance to the emperor, and forsaking the Catholic religion, should by that act forfeit his dignity and the property attached to it." This clause which was the only protection to the political rights, lawfully acquired by the Catholic Church, and which is known by the name of the *ecclesiastical reservation*, was at first strenuously opposed by the Protestant states; in the end they accepted it; and it became at a later period one of the chief causes of the Thirty Years' War.

The tranquillity of Germany was not disturbed during the latter half of the sixteenth century. But the Reformation had a baneful effect in hastening the dissolution of the empire, and thus bringing about that great catastrophe, which made Germany a desert, and effaced her for a length of time from the rank of first-rate powers.

We shall furnish the clearest insight into the causes of the Thirty Years' War by giving a short account of what took place amongst Catholics and Protestants during the interval of peace. The second article in the peace of Augsburg gave the princes of the empire a right to introduce into their states whatever doctrines or opinions they might think proper; and of this right, called *jus reformandi*, the Protestant states had profited to the utmost. To give one single example. In the Palatinate, the doctrine of Luther and the Protestant worship were introduced by Otho Henry, who suppressed the Catholic religion in 1556; at his death, three years afterwards, in 1559, his successor, Frederic III, introduced the doctrines of Calvin, in place of those of Luther. Louis, who succeeded Frederic in 1576, opposed the Calvinists, drove from the country all ministers who supported that doctrine, and re-established Lutheranism; which was again abolished by the electoral prince, Frederic IV, the son and successor of Louis, who in 1592 compelled the inhabitants of the

Palatinate for the fourth time to change their religion ; and each of these changes was accompanied by persecutions and violence done to those who refused to adopt the religious convictions of their princes.*

In every state subject to a Protestant prince the Catholic religion was wholly abolished ; all pious foundations, convents, abbeys, and other establishments were suppressed, and their wealth confiscated ; nor were the Protestant princes content with seizing such church property as lay in their immediate territories, they possessed themselves of a multitude of bishoprics and abbeys which enjoyed ecclesiastical immunity, and which owned no temporal sovereign but the emperor. When Ferdinand II, in 1629, published his famous edict of restitution, the number of archbishoprics and bishoprics, which, since the peace of Augsburg had fallen into the hands of the Protestants, was no fewer than fourteen, besides numerous abbeys and convents, which had shared the same fate.

While the Catholic religion was thus openly persecuted by the Protestant princes, and almost extirpated in their own dominions, the doctrines of Calvin, Luther, and other reformers, were fast gaining ground in the dominions of Catholic sovereigns. — In Bavaria, Austria, and Styria ; in the bishoprics of Salzburg, Bamberg, Würzburg, and others, the number of Protestants was increasing yearly. The convents, which had long been relaxing in their discipline, were forsaken by the monks ; the secular clergy contracted marriage ; and the Protestant faith was openly and freely practised. The nobles in particular hastened to embrace the new opinions ; and a contemporary writer, Lazarus Schwendi, who lived about 1590, assures us that in his time, almost all the German nobility in the Catholic, as well as in the Protestant states, had become converts, either openly or in secret, to the new religion.† The Catholic bishops of the empire, and also the dukes of Bavaria, and the emperors Ferdinand I and his successors, Maximilian II and Rodolphe II, practised in the first instance the greatest toleration towards their Protestant subjects. They allowed them communion under both kinds, and almost everywhere the free exercise of their religion. But instead of contenting themselves with these privileges, the Protestant nobility in Austria, Bavaria, and Styria, began to persecute the Catholic clergy, and to use every means in their power for propagating their own opinions, amongst other classes of people. Styria was so completely Protestantized, that when the young duke Ferdi-

* See Menzel *Neuere Geschichte der Deutschen*, tom. iv, v.

† Leo *Handbucher Universalgeschichte*, tom. iii. p. 308, in the note.

nand made his Easter communion at Graetz, his capital, in 1596, there were but three Catholics to be found in the whole town.* Almost all the nobility of Silesia, Lusatia, Moravia, and Bohemia, were Protestants; a majority of the professors at the university of Vienna were Protestants;† and the reformed states of Austria were permitted even in that town to practise their religion freely. The Catholic religion seemed on the point of being extirpated from Germany; it was revived, we will not hesitate to say it, by the zeal of the Society of Jesus, which Providence had evidently called to battle with the new enemies of the Church.‡

There were two obvious methods for arresting the progress of Protestantism: the first was to attack it with the arms of science; the second, to reorganize the education of Catholic youth. The Jesuits used these two means with as much zeal as talent. In a short time their order was filled with learned men, eminent in almost every branch of knowledge, who were called to fill the principal professorships in the Universities of Cologne, of Ingolstadt in Bavaria, and of Prague in Bohemia. The wisdom of their courses of study, and the circumspection with which they regulated their plans of education, soon obtained for them the confidence of Catholic princes, who entrusted them with the education of youth. Jesuit colleges were established in Bavaria, Austria, Styria, and Bohemia, as well as in many of the bishoprics of the empire. It was not long before the Protestants discovered that the Jesuits were their most formidable enemies; at once triumphing over them in the paths of science, and presenting a most striking contrast in their wonderful organization, with the continual divisions and disputes amongst the Protestant sects. Accordingly, persecutions were set on foot against them in Bavaria and Austria; and the Protestant nobility of the latter country succeeded in suppressing several of their colleges, which had been established in the reign of Ferdinand I.

Political opposition was frequently occasioned by the religious disunion between the Protestant subjects and their Catholic princes. Protestant princes had strengthened themselves, by uniting in their own hands both temporal and spiritual power;

* Ranke Geschichte der Roemischen Paebste, tom. ii, p. 402, 403.

† Raupach Evangelisches Oestreich, tom. iii, p. 166, 240, 299.

‡ The accusations brought against the Jesuits have been so often refuted, that we shall not resume the subject. Our readers will no doubt be acquainted with Dalla's excellent history of the Jesuits. It is curious to hear Luther, the author of the Reformation professing a principle which has been falsely attributed to the Jesuits, namely, that we may do evil that good may come; yet this is what the great reformer wrote in 1520 to his friend Lang: "*Nos hic persuasi sumus Papatum esse veri et Germani Antichristi sedem in cujus deceptionem et nequitiam ob salutem animarum nobis omnia licere arbitramur.*"—Menzel neuere Geschichte der Deutschen, tom. iv. p. 55, in the note.

but the Protestant inhabitants of Catholic territories maintained an absolute independence of their princes in all religious matters. The religious bond which united them amongst themselves, served to form them into a political party. "In every state," says a modern Protestant writer, "where the sovereign has remained faithful to the Catholic Church, Protestantism, by favouring the resistance of the nobility to the royal power, had brought about a fusion of political and religious interest; and although this fusion was not always intended by those who took part in it, it was always most inconvenient to the sovereign."* Taking advantage of the financial embarrassments of their princes, the Protestants obtained an extension of their religious privileges; and in the end, as it happened in Austria, Styria, Karinthia, and other Austrian provinces, they excluded the Catholics from the greater number of employments, by introducing Protestant ministers instead of Catholic priests in all churches where there was a right to collect money; and by confiscating the property of the pious establishments founded by their ancestors.† In Styria, they had excluded the Catholics from all employments depending on the state, which were given to Protestants: and the opposition of the Protestant states, as well as the continual struggles resulting from it betwixt them and the Archduke Charles, sovereign of this country, occasioned the premature death of that prince.‡ Protestant ministers, supported by the nobility, preached openly against the Catholic religion, and attacked in the most virulent sermons, the Pope, the Catholic church, and even their princes, whom they represented as idolaters;|| and in many bishoprics and other ecclesiastical principalities, the Protestants, who at first were only tolerated, gained such strength, as to nominate the successors of the Catholic prelates, and to choose them from amongst men who were known to be partizans of the new doctrines, and who openly embraced them on their accession to power.§ In these circumstances, the Catholic princes were at least excusable, when, finding their political existence at stake, they made use of a power conferred on them by the *Peace of Augsburg*, and which had been vigorously exercised by Protestant sovereigns,—that of allowing the free exercise of only one religion in their dominions. This reaction against Protestantism began to manifest itself in the

* Menzel, loc. cit. t. v. p. 29.

† Address from the Catholic states of Austria to the Archduke Mathias in Khevenhüller, Annalis Ferdinand, t. v. pp. 3151-3172.

‡ Menzel, loc. cit. t. v, p. 318.

|| Opitz, a Protestant minister, preached such sermons even at Vienna: Menzel, loc. cit. t. v, pp. 69-70.

§ This happened at Halberstadt, Magdeburg, Naumburg, Verden, Brëmen, and other bishoprics.

Catholic principalities of the empire towards the close of the sixteenth century.

The free exercise of Protestant worship was suppressed in the bishoprics of Cologne, Munster, Hildersheim, Bamberg, Wurtzburg, and Salzburg, and also in Bavaria; but every where, those who would not give up the free exercise of their religion, were allowed permission to sell their property, and to emigrate. The Emperor Rodolphe II, who in 1576 succeeded his father Maximilian II, did not interfere in the religious disputes of the empire; on the contrary, he carefully avoided raising any such questions in the general diets, and gave his sedulous attention to the physical sciences, mathematics, astrology, and astronomy: he soon began to neglect public business completely, so that Hungary fell into such a state of disorder, that his brother Mathias was obliged, with the consent of the other princes of the family, to constitute himself head of the House of Austria (1606). Rodolphe retained only the government of Bohemia, and the Protestant states of that country obliged him by a royal letter (1609) to guarantee their freedom of religious worship. In the meanwhile, the diet of Ratisbon had alarmed the Protestant princes of the empire, by taking into consideration the numerous infractions of *the ecclesiastical reservation* which had taken place; and at this period (1608) they concluded a new league called "*the Union*," by which they renewed the old confederation of Schmalkald. They resumed their negotiations with the Kings of France and England, and with the Republic of Venice. "The object of this confederation was evidently to overthrow the ancient constitution of Germany, and to oppose the emperor openly;* and if it should be necessary, with the assistance of foreign powers." Two years after this, (in 1610) *the union* entered into an alliance with the King of France, Henry IV, whose object was to overthrow the power of Austria, that he might put himself at the head of the christian republic, which he believed he could form, by uniting all the different European states in one political body. But Germany was saved from foreign dominion by two Catholic princes, Duke Maximilian of Bavaria, and his cousin Duke Ferdinand of Styria; the latter was the successor of his father Charles: he had abolished the Protestant worship in his dominions, and recovered his authority, which under the preceding reign the Protestant states had reduced to a mere shadow. Both these princes had been brought up by the Jesuits, and were remarkable for their sincere piety, and for a purity of morals by no means common amongst sovereigns at that period. The character of Maximilian has been

* Leo Handbuch, t. iii, p. 340.

described to us as follows, by Menzel: "This prince laboured with as much wisdom as firmness to consolidate the greatness and power of his country, and by the order which he introduced into his finances, his wise and just government, and his conscientious observance of all his duties, became a model to the age he lived in, of a virtuous and active prince."* The dangerous situation of the empire did not escape Maximilian; he succeeded in forming a confederation of Catholic princes, which took the name of *the League*, and which was constituted to defend the nationality of Germany against the schemes of Henry IV. But just as he was about to attack Germany, King Henry was assassinated; and a peace which was concluded at Munich (1610) between the *Union* and the *League*, preserved the country from the horrors of civil war.

Two years afterwards (1612), the Emperor Rodolphe died, and his brother Mathias succeeded him as emperor and as king of Bohemia. But his efforts were in vain to re-establish peace in the empire, and to put an end to continual discord. The members of the *Union* renewed their association, and thereby forced the Catholic princes, who, at the emperor's desire, had dissolved the *League*, to conclude new alliances amongst themselves. The revolt of the Protestant states of Bohemia—which had exceeded the privileges allowed them by the Emperor Rodolphe's royal letter†—gave the signal for a war that, with few interruptions, lasted for thirty years. The emperor had decided against an arbitrary interpretation of the royal letter; and the Protestants, believing their rights to be in consequence infringed upon, committed great violences against the imperial governors; two of these, Martinitz and Slavata, together with their secretary Fabricius, were thrown from the windows of the Castle of Prague. After this they levied troops, and placed them under the command of the Count de Thurn, one of the chiefs of their party. The Jesuits were accused of troubling the public peace, and banished from the country; and the states, in a long apology, informed the emperor of what had happened. Mathias, who was then sick at Vienna, replied that he would send a person of high

* Menzel loc. cit. t. v, p. 316.—Mitchell's declamations (Life of Wallenstein, pp. 20-21) against Ferdinand of Styria, are proofs of this author's superficial knowledge of history; he is refuted by the almost unanimous testimony of modern Protestant writers, such as Menzel, Leo, and others.

† There is not any doubt as to this fact, for the Archbishop of Prague and the Abbot of Braunau had an incontestable right to close those churches which their Protestant subjects had built without their consent at Klostergal and at Braunau, supposing even that there were any uncertainty in the words of the royal letter. Leo Handbuch, t. iii. p. 354. Mitchell has clearly not understood the subject in dispute (Life of Wallenstein, p. 26).

rank to take cognizance of the affair, and commanded them to disband their troops. Instead of obeying this order, the States increased their army, and marched against those towns that refused to make common cause with them. The emperor, thus compelled to take energetic measures against the rebels, marched troops into Bohemia. But the attention of all Germany had been already excited by the events that had taken place at Prague. The Protestant states of Silesia, Moravia and Austria, did not hesitate to manifest their sympathy with their co-religionists; and the Protestant union sent to their aid a body of 4000 men, commanded by Count Ernest de Mansfeld, an able officer, who had left the Austrian service in disgust, at not being, as he thought, sufficiently rewarded. He took the town of Pilsen, where the inhabitants, who were Catholics, had remained faithful to the emperor. However, the Protestant states of Bohemia, and those of Silesia who joined them, began a fresh negotiation with the emperor, and the electoral prince of Saxony had offered his mediation, when Mathias died (1619), leaving the crown of Bohemia to Duke Ferdinand of Styria, who had already been acknowledged to be his successor by the states of this kingdom,—by those of Hungary, Silesia and Moravia,—and by the princes of the empire. Ferdinand became head of the house of Austria at a most critical moment. Bohemia was in the power of the revolted Protestants; the states of Lusatia, Silesia and Moravia, had joined the rebels; Prince Bethlem Gabor, who governed Transylvania, as a vassal of the Turks, aspired, with the hope of their assistance, to the crown of Hungary; the Protestant states of the Duchy of Austria refused to acknowledge Ferdinand, to whom his cousin Albert, Duke of the Low Countries, had ceded his title to that country,—the Bohemians, profiting by these circumstances, refused all the propositions made to them by their new sovereign; and the Count de Thurn marched against Vienna. But Ferdinand was saved by the heroic firmness with which, despising the threats of the rebels, he refused his consent to the shameful proposals they made to him.

The advance of the imperial general Bourquoi, who had entered Bohemia, forced Thurn to raise the siege of Vienna, and to return to Prague. After the retreat of the enemy, Ferdinand went to Frankfort, where he assumed the crown of Germany in spite of the protestations of the states of Bohemia, and of the opposition of the electoral prince-palatine, Frederick V, the head of the Protestant union. The unanimity of the other princes in favour of Ferdinand, forced the elector-palatine to give way, and to acknowledge him as emperor. But the courage of Ferdinand was again to be severely tried; the states of Bohemia had deposd

him, in flagrant violation of the laws * of the kingdom, and of the act by which they had themselves recognized him as the successor of Mathias. They had elected in his stead the electoral-prince, Frederick V, who accepted the crown, depending upon receiving assistance from the Protestant union,—from his relatives the sovereigns of England and Denmark,—and also from France. Vienna, besieged a second time by the Count de Thurn and Prince Bethlem Gabor, who had joined their forces under the walls of the town, again owed its safety to the firmness of the emperor, who defended it himself, and forced the allies to raise the siege. Whilst Ferdinand was opposing his enemies with unshaken courage, the electoral-prince, Frederic, who had usurped the throne of Bohemia, wasted his time in festivities, and discontented the Lutheran states of his kingdom by introducing the Calvinistic forms of worship into the cathedral of Prague. Without taking any steps for the defence of the country, he amused himself in displaying the pomp of his rank, as if he had had nothing to fear from such a rival as Ferdinand, who had become his sovereign since his election at Frankfort, and to whom Frederic himself had done homage as a vassal of the empire. He had, in fact, rendered himself guilty of treason, by accepting a crown to which Ferdinand had a double claim, in the first place, as emperor, and in the second, by virtue of that act by which the states of Bohemia had acknowledged him as the successor of Mathias. These facts were so evident, that the greater part of the members of the Protestant union, of which he was himself the head, refused to give him their assistance to defend the throne he had usurped from the emperor.† At the same time, Ferdinand found an ally as faithful as disinterested, in his cousin Maximilian, Duke of Bavaria, who had restored the ancient Catholic league, and became again the defender of the constitution of the empire, which, by the revolt of the Bohemians, and the treason of the electoral prince-palatine, was placed in imminent danger of entire dissolution. An army was raised, and placed under the command of John Tserclaes, Baron de Tilly, a Belgian by birth, and an experienced general. As many modern authors, and amongst the rest Mitchell, have represented this man as a monster of cruelty and barbarity, it is important for us to know his character as it has been represented to us by contemporary writers. “Tilly was as much distinguished by his military talents as by his sincere piety and irreproachable morals. Often borrowing time from the night for prayer, when his occu-

* Menzel, des Geschichte des dreissigjährigen Krieges, t. i. p. 332-334.

† Londorp Acta publica, Tubingæ, 1739, t. i. p. 873.

pations had left him none in the day, and joining to the temperance of a hermit the chastity of a monk."* At his death he left no fortune, though he had not wanted opportunities for amassing one, had he followed the example of Wallenstein, and other commanders of the period.

Besides the Duke of Bavaria, the electoral prince of Saxony, although a Protestant, espoused the emperor's cause, and entered Lusatia (a province of Bohemia) at the head of an army. The imperial troops having joined those of the league, Duke Maximilian, who commanded the army in person, led them to Prague, where he won the famous victory upon the White Mountain, a hill near that city (1620). This victory put an end to the Bohemian revolt, and overthrew the throne of Frederic, who fled in haste from his kingdom, without making a single effort to defend it.† Ferdinand had recovered by force of arms his power in Bohemia, and he had not only the right, but, according to the ideas of the age, it was his duty to punish the chiefs of a party who had drawn upon the country all the horrors of a bloody war, and who had exercised the utmost oppression against all who remained faithful to their ancient religion and to their sovereign. A sentence of death pronounced against rebels who had twice besieged the emperor in his residence, can certainly only be considered in the light of a just punishment of the high treason of which the Protestant states of Bohemia had rendered themselves guilty. Their trial was regular in all its forms, and judgment was pronounced upon them according to the laws of the kingdom.‡ Nevertheless (and this we learn from a Protestant contemporary historian, and a defender of his co-religionists), the emperor wished to save the life of the accused, upon the single condition of their acknowledging their guilt, and making an open submission. Upon their repeated refusal of these terms, Ferdinand, after a night passed without sleep, signed the death-warrant of the most guilty, but commuted the sentence into exile or imprisonment for the remainder.§ No member of the Protestant

* This testimony, which is borne to Tilly by many of his contemporaries (amongst the rest Adelreiter (*Annales Boicæ gentis*, t. iii. lib. 17), and the Marshal Grammont, *Memoirs*), has been ratified by the modern Protestant authors, Zschokke, *Baierische Geschichte*, Aarau, 1820, t. iii. p. 221, and Menzel, *Geschichte des dreissigjährigen*, t. i. p. 366.

† The conduct of this prince has been severely blamed by Menzel, *loc. cit.* t. i. p. 487.

‡ Tilly, who commanded at Prague, gave to the accused under his charge every facility for escaping, and even suggested to them, through one of his friends, that they might do so; but, for some reason quite unknown to us, they did not avail themselves of the power. Habernfeld, *de Bello Bohemico*, p. 61.

§ *Historia persecutionum Ecclesiæ Bohemiæ*, p. 220; Habernfeld, *loc. cit.*; Menzel, *loc. cit.* t. ii. p. 44-47; Leo Handbuch, t. iii. p. 368, in the note.

states of Silesia and Moravia was punished with death, although they had taken an active part in the revolt of the Bohemians. In Austria, one man only, Paul Golt, was executed at Vienna. Moreover, the emperor confirmed to the Bohemians all their privileges and political liberty, not even excepting the religious freedom granted to them by the royal letter of Rodolphe II.*

Such was the conduct of Ferdinand, as it is described to us in the historical records of the times, which completely disprove the charges brought against this prince by Mitchell. "Not a single act of pardon," he says, "not a single remission of punishment was granted. . . . One act of severity followed another. Ferdinand, with his own hands, cut in two the Bohemian Magna Charta, and burned the seal. . . . Ferdinand spared his Austrian subjects as little as he spared his Bohemians."† This author then indulges in the most violent declamations against the emperor, who, after punishing the rebels, suppressed Protestantism in Bohemia. But it was clearly rather political considerations than a spirit of intolerance which influenced Ferdinand in his conduct. From the time of the Hussites downwards, Protestant doctrines had more than once drawn the inhabitants into revolt and disorder; and the emperor was persuaded that the re-establishment of the Catholic religion could alone secure his authority in that kingdom.‡

In Silesia, where Protestantism was predominant, Ferdinand established religious liberty; and at his coronation at Prague (1627), the Protestant Dukes of Brieg, of Siegnitz, and of Oels, filled the posts of honour due to their rank. There cannot, therefore, be any reproach cast upon Ferdinand upon this subject. "His persecution of the Protestants in Bohemia," says Menzel, "was a consistent working out of the principle which the Reformation introduced, that sovereigns had a right to regulate the belief and the worship of their subjects. The Protestant princes had used this right in all its extent, and they considered it as an inalienable privilege."§

At any rate, the emperor permitted his Protestant subjects to emigrate from Bohemia, and allowed them six months to dispose of their property. It is true, that those who were entrusted with

* Menzel, loc. cit. t. ii. p. 99, 100; Schmidt, *Geschichte der Deutschen*, t. ix. p. 223, 227.

† Life of Wallenstein, p. 72-77. Mitchell appears to misunderstand the scope of the royal letter of the emperor Rodolphe, when he calls it a magna charta. The letter had nothing whatever to do with the political liberties of the kingdom of Bohemia.

‡ Schmidt, *Geschichte der Deutschen*, t. ix. p. 223; Menzel, loc. cit. p. 94, 95.

§ *Geschichte des dreissigjährigen Krieges*, t. ii. p. 101.

the execution of the imperial orders committed some violences; but they were often provoked by the Protestant peasants, who, following the example of the Hussites formerly, took up arms, and killed Catholic priests and noblemen.* The emperor's arms had been successful also in the empire; the whole of the Palatinate, with the exception of a few towns, had been subdued by the Spanish general Spinola, who had been sent to the assistance of the emperor. Ferdinand had pronounced the ban of the empire against the electoral prince Frederic and his ally Duke Christian of Anhalt: he had conferred the forfeited dignity of Frederic on the Duke Maximilian of Bavaria. The Protestant union had laid down arms, and the emperor had declared his intention to convoke a diet for the month of September, 1621, in order to terminate the war, and to re-examine the affairs of the electoral prince Frederic and of his allies. While every act of the emperor thus shewed that he respected the rights which the constitution assured to the princes of the empire, two princes, who may be termed adventurers, continued to despise his authority, and to trouble the peace of Germany. Count Ernest of Mansfeld, and Christian of Brunswick, the administrator of the bishopric of Halberstadt, offered their services to the electoral prince Frederic, and induced him to continue the war against the emperor, instead of submitting to the decision of the diet. Ernest was the natural son of Count Peter of Mansfeld, a Catholic, and a general in the service of Austria: he had been legitimatized by Rodolph II, and had served a long time in the imperial armies. He quitted the Austrian service, and entered into communication with the *Union*, changing, at the same time, his religion for that of Protestantism. The Count de Mansfeld was a distinguished soldier, but he was the first who proclaimed that pernicious maxim, "that war should be made to levy its own resources." The Bohemian states had taken him into their employment when they first rose in rebellion, and he had conducted the army which the Union sent to their assistance. After the battle upon the White Mountain, he was forced to quit Bohemia, and withdrew into the Palatinate, where he defended Heidelberg against the Spanish army. He had thought fit, however, to enter into negotiations with the emperor, with a view to re-entering his service, when he acquired a worthy companion in arms in the person of Christian of Brunswick. At sixteen years old, Christian had been made administrator of the bishopric of Halberstadt, (1616,) through his father's influence with the chapter of that town, which had already embraced Pro-

* Menzel, loc. cit. p. 97.

testantism. The emperor refused to confirm to this young man the possession of a bishopric which had been secularized against the provisions of the religious peace of Augsburg. Fearing to lose the means of supporting his lavish expenditure, and in love with the Princess Elizabeth, the wife of the Prince Palatine Frederic—he had fastened the princess's glove to his hat, with the devise "All for God and for her"—this dissolute young man flew to war, which was his great passion.

He raised troops in 1621, and laid waste the Catholic territories of Westphalia, pillaging the churches and convents. "He had in his army," says Menzel, "incendiaries who set fire to towns and villages in the most scientific manner; he boasted publicly of what he had done to the women in Catholic countries, and horribly mutilated all the Catholic priests who fell into his hands."*

Mansfeld and Christian were joined by the Margrave George Frederic of Baden, formerly a member of the Protestant Union; and these three princes declared war against the emperor, in the name of the Prince Palatine Frederic.

It is thus impossible to blame the Catholic party or the Emperor Ferdinand, for the continuation of the war. The Count de Tilly, who commanded the Catholic army, conquered these three princes, one after the other, took Heidelberg and Mannheim, and forced the Prince Palatine Frederic to separate his cause from that of his allies. Christian and Mansfeld† entered at first into the service of the republic of Holland, but soon quitted it. Mansfeld invaded Ostfriesland, and demanded from the Count of Oldenburg, who had taken no part whatever in the war, the sum of 150,000 thalers, and a free passage through his territory. Christian entered the country of Osnabrück, maintaining his troops by pillage. The diet which the emperor had called, and which was then sitting at Ratisbon (1623), confirmed the sentence pronounced against the Prince Palatine Frederic, and also the investiture of Prince Maximilian of Bavaria with the electoral dignity. It decided also upon putting an end to the rapine of these two adventurers: and Tilly was ordered to continue the war against them. He compelled them to seek refuge in the north of Germany, where, despairing of success, they disbanded their troops. Christian went to Italy, and Mansfeld followed him soon after (1624). "The conquest of the Palatinate," says Mitchell, "and the expulsion from

* Dreissigjährigen Krieges, t. ii. p. 80.

† These two chiefs at this time offered their services to the emperor, thus shewing what were the true motives of their actions. Ferdinand rejected the offer. See Handbuch, t. iii. p. 371.

Germany of Mansfeld and the Duke of Brunswick, terminated the second act of the Thirty Years' War. It was again in Ferdinand's power to sheath the sword: he stood alone in the arena, but he stood armed, and his conduct and formidable attitude soon forced the remnants of the opposite party to adopt measures of security. It was easy to see that the liberty of Protestant Germany could not long be maintained, unless the power of the emperor and of the Catholics was confined within narrower bounds."* We shall see that these remarks have no historical foundation, and that they fall before an accurate knowledge of facts.

The success of his arms had raised the emperor to a degree of power which alarmed the ancient enemies of the house of Austria. The republic of Holland feared that Philip IV, king of Spain, might renew the war with them, in expectation of receiving the support of Ferdinand, in return for the services he had rendered to this prince. The Cardinal de Richelieu, who was now in power, had begun to develop his political system, of which the principal object was to weaken the house of Hapsburg, which now, since the conquest of the Palatinate, menaced France on three sides at once. It was to be feared, moreover, that the emperor might reclaim the three bishoprics of Metz, Toul, and Verdun, which France had taken possession of during the war of Schmalkald. The King of Denmark, Christian IV, who, by right of his duchy of Holstein, was prince of the empire, feared that the *ecclesiastical reservation* might be brought into operation as to the archbishoprics of Brême and Lübeck, which had been secularized by a prince of his family, John Frederic. He was desirous also of obtaining the bishopric of Hildesheim for his son. These three powers found an unexpected ally in the person of James I, king of England. Up to this time, James I had constantly refused to take part in the war, or to assist his son-in-law the Prince Palatine Frederic: his motive for this refusal was his desire to marry his only son Charles to a Spanish princess, daughter to Philip IV. With this view, he had sent his son to the court of Madrid, accompanied by the Duke of Buckingham.

The scruples of Philip IV at marrying his daughter to a heretic prince, had been quieted by a dispensation granted by Pope Gregory XV; but as this Pontiff died immediately afterwards, the king wished the dispensation to be confirmed by his successor, Urban VIII. The Duke of Buckingham, who was hated by the Spaniards for the haughtiness of his disposition,

* Life of Wallenstein, p. 85.

made a skilful use of the delays attendant upon these negotiations, to persuade the prince that he was trifled with by the court of Madrid. The prince left Spain precipitately, and the negotiations concerning the marriage were broken off (1624). The king believed the statements of his son and his favourite, and yielded to the solicitations of his daughter, and her husband the Prince Palatine Frederick, for assistance against the Emperor Ferdinand, by which also, he obtained revenge against the house of Habsburg. Accordingly he made overtures to France, and asked, for his son, the hand of Henrietta, daughter of Henry IV. In 1625, an alliance was concluded at the Hague, between England, France, Holland and Denmark. James the First, it is true, died the same year; but his son and successor, Charles I, followed up the designs of his father. The allies attempted to draw into their coalition, Prince Bethlem Gabor, who governed Hungary as vassal of the Turks, and also the Republic of Venice, an ancient enemy of the house of Austria. A letter written by the Prince Palatine Frederic, to the Count de Thurn, (who, having been banished from Bohemia, was living at Venice,) fell into the hands of Tilly,* and was the first notice of this alliance, of which nothing had as yet transpired. "The King of Denmark," writes Frederick to Thurn, "remains faithful to his engagements, and continues his preparations; he has lately raised 10,000 infantry; but he must be assisted with money, and the King of England will do his utmost in this respect. The Republic of Venice cannot employ its money better than in supporting this prince,—the King of Hungary, (Bethlem Gabor,) has not received any of your letters, but he has received some of mine by a different channel." Some time afterwards another document became known, bearing evidence that the King of Denmark had undertaken to raise an army of 38,000 men, by means of large subsidies which he expected to receive from England and Holland.† It was agreed, moreover, that Mansfeld, and Christian of Brunswick, should be authorized to levy troops, and to recommence their devastating warfare.

The former succeeded in raising 15,000 men in England, and in joining these troops to those that Christian had enrolled in France; they met at Bergen op Zoom, from whence they marched together towards Northern Germany. The Protestant princes of the circle of Lower Saxony, made common cause with the ene-

* An extract from this letter, dated the 14th September 1625, is to be seen in Schmidt Geschichte der Deutschen. t. ix. p. 270.

† Londorp Acta publica, t. iii. p. 802. Cardinal de Richelieu had promised a subsidy of a million of francs: Ranke, die Römischen Päbste, t. ii. p. 508.

mies of the emperor. Many amongst them had seized upon Church property, and feared the execution of the *ecclesiastical reservation*; they therefore raised troops, of which they gave the command to the King of Denmark, making him commander in chief of the military power of the circle. In these circumstances the emperor saw himself obliged to take extraordinary measures, if he wished to prevent the empire from falling a prey to foreign enemies, who concealed their true designs under the mask of religion, and who called themselves the champions of religious liberty, which they themselves in their own countries trampled under foot. “Hardly ever, (says Leo) has a foreign power interfered in the affairs of Germany, in a more egotistical spirit than did the King of Denmark at this period.* The army of the League, commanded by Tilly, could not suffice to meet so many enemies at once, and the emperor knew not where to find means for raising another. He was extricated from this difficulty by Albert de Wallenstein, or W^{al}stein, who played so great a part during this war. He was the son of a rich Bohemian nobleman, who had become Protestant, but having lost his father at the age of twelve, his Catholic uncle Slavata had sent him to the Jesuit College at Olmutz, where he was brought back to the Catholic Church. As he grew older, he travelled through Germany, England, France, and Italy, accompanied by Peter Verdungus, a learned mathematician and astrologer. He had studied at the Universities of Padua and Bologna, giving particular attention to mathematics and astrology,† and to the military sciences.

On his return from Italy, he entered the service of the house of Austria, and fought for the Archduke Ferdinand of Styria, in a war against the Republic of Venice. He soon distinguished himself by his military talents, and was rapidly promoted.

By a marriage with a rich widow, who at her death left him a considerable fortune, he was raised to the rank of the first nobility of the country. When the Bohemian rebellion broke out, he declared openly for the emperor; at his own expense he raised a regiment of cavalry and fought in the Imperial army. After the war he purchased a great deal of land, that had been forfeited by the rebels, and the emperor gave him the title of Duke of Friedland, and the rank of a prince of the empire. Endowed

* Handbuch, t. iii. p. 374.

† We must not be surprised at Wallenstein's predilection for astrology, at a period when astronomy was so successfully cultivated by Tycho Brahe, and Kepler, and when the Emperor Rodolph II could forget the affairs of his empire, in observations on the stars. It is certain that Wallenstein's actions were greatly influenced by astrology, which in the end caused him to hasten to his destruction.

with great perspicuity and acuteness of mind, Wallenstein united to great energy of character a high degree of ambition. No one knew better than he did how to gain the affection of his soldiers, to whom he was most prodigally generous, even while maintaining strict discipline, with inexorable severity: he was consequently both beloved and feared by his army. Such was the man, who offered to raise for the emperor an army of 40,000 men, without requiring extra assistance. The examples of Mansfeld, of Christian of Brunswick, and of other captains of the time, were at hand to confirm what he had learned by his own experience in war, and to encourage him to make a promise, which the emperor's council were inclined at first to believe impossible of fulfilment. The religious troubles, which during the sixteenth century, desolated every country in Europe, had prodigiously increased the number of those, who, driven from their country, and entirely ruined, sought the means of subsistence in a military life. Armies were nearly all composed of mercenary soldiers; and war swelled the ranks with men, who cared only for their pay and for booty, and were ready to follow any captain who was generous and successful in arms. It was not uncommon, after a battle, to see the prisoners of war enrol themselves in the lines of the conqueror. The security offered by the name of the emperor, in whose cause he raised his army, together with his own great wealth and military renown, brought together in a few weeks 32,000 men under the standard of Wallenstein.

In spite of the protestations they had made, that their armaments were intended only for the defence of their own territories, the princes of the circle of Lower Saxony were the first to begin hostilities, by crossing the frontiers of their circle, whilst Mansfeld and Christian laid waste the Duchy of Clèves (1625.) The emperor considered these acts as a declaration of war, and Wallenstein and Tilly marched against the enemy. These two generals combined their plans of operation so well, that nearly the whole war was carried on in the enemies' country; while Wallenstein, marching against Mansfeld, defeated him near Dessau, and forced him to take the road to Venice alone. He died during this journey, at Urakowitz in Illyria. Tilly obtained, near Lutter, a decisive victory over the King of Denmark, who escaped with difficulty from the battle, having lost his ally, Christian of Brunswick, who died of some complaint in 1626. The King of Denmark was now supported chiefly by English troops. By the aid of the subsidies he received from Richelieu, he reorganized his army; declared the Archbishop of Bremen, whom he suspected of a secret correspondence with the emperor, to be deposed from his see, and named his own son Frederick, Archbishop of Bremen, and

Bishop of Halberstadt. In this last town, the Archduke Leopold William, son of the emperor, had been elected by the chapter, after the death of Christian of Bruuswick. "It was the old project of the Kings of Denmark, to make themselves masters of the north of Germany, re-appearing under a new form, and disguised under the name of zeal for the interest of religion. To save the honour of Germany, it was necessary to march against the usurper.*

Tilly and Wallenstein united their victorious forces in Mecklenburg (in 1627) and, at the head of 80,000 men, drove the Danes from the German territories, to the frontiers of Jutland. The greater part of the princes of Lower Saxony, such as the Dukes George of Lunenburg, Frederic Ulric of Brunswick, and others, renounced their alliance with the King of Denmark, and submitted to the emperor, who thought it right, severely to punish those that persisted in their guilty intrigues with the enemies of the empire. He deprived the Dukes of Mecklenburg of their dignities and possessions, and bestowed this duchy upon his victorious general Wallenstein, who was already Duke of Sagan, in Silesia, and who thus became one of the most powerful princes of the Empire.† This general was now engrossed with two schemes, which, if he could have carried them into execution, would have entirely changed the situation of Germany, relatively to the other northern powers of Europe. The first was, to procure the King of Denmark to be deposed by his subjects, and the Emperor Ferdinand to be elected in his place; the second, to restore, in some measure, the Hanseatic League, by granting great privileges to the maritime towns, on the borders of the Baltic and the Northern Ocean. Germany would thus have had a naval force, which might have coped with that of England, Holland, or Denmark. But the first project failed from the fidelity of the Danes; the second was defeated by the resistance of the town of Stralsund, and the intervention of Gustavus Adolphus, King of Sweden, in the affairs of Germany.

The victories obtained by the generals of the emperor, had forced the King of Denmark to negotiate; and a congress was held at Lübeck, for the purpose of concluding a peace, while Wallenstein was besieging the town of Stralsund, which had received a Danish garrison. In the meanwhile, the emperor

* Leo Handbuch, t. iii. p. 382.

† The emperor has been often blamed for this act, as being contrary to the privileges of the princes of the empire;—but it must be considered, that the Dukes of Mecklenburg had deprived themselves of these privileges, by contracting alliances with the enemies of the empire, and that, consequently, Ferdinand only used the rights of war, when he treated Mecklenburg as a conquered country.

laboured to restore internal order in the empire, and, for this purpose, convoked (in 1627) a meeting of the electoral princes, at Mühlhaus. In this assembly, Duke Maximilian was generally recognized as an electoral prince, and the emperor took the sense of the meeting upon the case of the Prince Palatine Frederic.

The unanimous opinion was, that the prince should submit to the emperor; that he should make the *amende honorable*; that he should renounce the crown of Bohemia, and the dignity of electoral prince, and that he should defray the expenses of the war. Upon these conditions, the ban which had been laid upon him was to be taken off, and a part of his territories restored to him. This affair settled, the emperor required the advice of the Catholic princes, upon the best manner of obtaining the restitution of the ecclesiastical property which the Protestants had seized upon since the peace of Augsburg, and contrary to the *ecclesiastical reservation*, which was then guaranteed. The Catholic states insisted upon obtaining this restitution, because the constitution of the empire solemnly guaranteed the rights of the Catholic Church, and of its members; and because the religious peace had only been accepted by the Catholic states, upon the express condition, that a prelate changing his religion, should, of necessity, be deposed. It was, in consequence of this opinion, that the emperor published the famous edict of restitution two years afterwards (1629.) This edict decreed the restitution of all the Church property, which had been sequestered or confiscated by Protestants since the religious peace in 1555, and gave to Catholic states the right to withhold from their Protestant subjects freedom of worship, though they were to be left at liberty to emigrate. This last decree was grounded upon the "right that had always been claimed by Protestant states of *reforming* their subjects, and banishing those that opposed them."* This edict has been loudly blamed, and represented as an act of extreme injustice: "The right of long established possession," says Mitchell, "was entirely overlooked, and Ferdinand forgot, in his zeal for the Church, that he was actually setting himself up as a judge in a case in which he was a party also."† Our limits will not allow us to enter into a long dissertation, to prove, that the emperor upon this occasion, acted conformably to the ideas of right generally entertained at that period. We will content ourselves with opposing to the opinion we have just quoted—those of two modern Protestant authors,

* Khevenhüller Annales Ferdinandez, t. xi. p. 438.

† Life of Wallenstein, p. 126.

who have been hitherto our principal guides: "If we consider only the positive right," says Menzel, "we cannot attack the edict of restitution."*

'The Protestant states," says Leo, "had always acknowledged the *ecclesiastical reservation* to be a binding law of the empire; many of them, in order to keep possession of the Church property they had appropriated, caused themselves to be consecrated bishops, according to the Catholic rites, that they might obtain a confirmation from the Pope. It was not, therefore, contrary to the principles of justice that the emperor should execute a law of the empire, as soon as it was in his power to do so; and when it is remembered, that very lately the King of Denmark had attempted to seize upon ecclesiastical property, as if it had been part of the domains of his crown, in order to found upon the possession of them, an usurped power in the north of Germany, it may be safely argued, that the emperor not only had the right, but that in his position it might even be his duty, to put into execution the ecclesiastical reservation. It is true, that it is quite a revolutionary principle to give the sovereign a right to determine the religious opinions of his subjects, (*jus reformandi*) but the Protestants had first insisted upon this principle, and the Catholic princes, when they adopted it, did no more than follow the example."†

A peace had been concluded with the king of Denmark at Lübeck, but Wallenstein had been obliged to raise the siege of Stralsund, whose inhabitants had derived fresh courage from the arrival of a body of Swedish troops, who repulsed the attacks of the enemy. Instigated by a desire to be revenged on the king of Sweden, and penetrating perhaps into the ambitious projects of this prince, Wallenstein sent a body of troops, commanded by his general Arnheim or Arnim, to the assistance of Sigismund, the king of Poland, who was now on the point of putting an end to his long war with Sweden by an armistice. With the remainder of his troops Wallenstein blockaded Magdeburg, which refused to open its gates to the emperor's son, who was designated archbishop. The Emperor Ferdinand was now at the height of his power; and many modern writers, amongst others M. Menzel,‡ have blamed him, in the sincerity of their patriotism, for not taking this opportunity to re-establish the political unity of Germany, by restricting within narrower limits the power and privileges of the states of the empire, and thereby strengthening the royal authority.

"The German monarchy, (they say,) had it been thus more firmly and securely based, might have struggled successfully against France and

* Geschichte des dreissigjährigen Krieges, t. ii. p. 182.

† Handbuch, t. iii. p. 386-387.

‡ Geschichte des Dreissigjährigen Krieges, tom. ii. p. 228-230.

England, who, by adopting these means, had been able to secure their nationality and political preponderance ; while Germany, on the contrary, had fallen into a shameful dependence upon foreign powers."

We are far from contesting the truth of these observations, but instead of considering Ferdinand's conduct as on this account blamable, we think it deserves the highest praise. If he had merited the reproaches so continually cast upon him, and if ambition and egotism had been really the motives of his actions, would he have lost such an opportunity as this for establishing an absolute monarchy upon the ruins of the ancient constitution of the empire? On the contrary, Ferdinand had so great a love of justice, and so much respect for the rights and privileges of those whose sovereign he was, that he was not to be drawn into a single act of violence. He gave the strongest proof of these sentiments at the Diet of Ratisbon.

He had convoked that assembly in 1630, in order to secure to his eldest son Ferdinand the succession to the throne, and also to concert means for carrying into execution the edict of restitution, and for establishing peace and order in the empire. But he met with unexpected opposition from the electoral princes, as well Catholic as Protestant, who, forgetting their religious discords, made common cause, and demanded as the first condition of peace, the dismissal of Wallenstein and the reduction of the imperial army. Many causes had contributed to excite this hatred against the emperor's generalissimo. Wallenstein had raised himself from an obscure Bohemian nobleman to the rank of one of the most powerful princes of the empire ; he was now at the head of a victorious army, and the princes became alarmed at his avowed determination to cause the emperor's authority to be respected by every one whomsoever.* The Duke of Bavaria was displeased at the decline of his influence, since the success of his general had rendered Ferdinand independent of the Catholic league ; and Maximilian put himself at the head of those who required the dismissal of Wallenstein. It was true also that violence and excesses had been perpetrated by the imperial troops, even in the territories of the friendly princes ; but this was an inevitable consequence of war, and of the peculiar organization of armies at that period, which could not fairly be charged to the account of Wallenstein.

The French cabinet laboured, by its intrigues, to induce the emperor to take the fatal resolution of granting the request of

* According to his enemies he had said, "that there was no occasion for electoral princes ; that it was expedient to take from them their rank ; and that in future, following the example of France and Spain, where there was but one sovereign, Germany should have but one emperor."—Menzel, *loc. cit.*

the states, and dismissing the only true support of his throne. Richelieu had succeeded in breaking up the power of the Huguenots, who, after the siege of Rochelle (1628), ceased to form a political party in France; he then resumed his favourite policy of weakening the House of Austria, and by his mediation a definitive peace was concluded between Sweden and Poland (1629); while, at the same time, M. Charnacé, the French ambassador, was negotiating an alliance between Gustavus Adolphus and France; and the Baron de Brulart and Father Joseph arrived at Ratisbon to foment discord between the princes and the emperor. Pressed by the French ambassador, Ferdinand sent his dismissal to Wallenstein, who obeyed without hesitation; thus confounding his adversaries, who had laboured to instil suspicions of his fidelity* into the mind of the emperor. The army was diminished by one half, and the command of it was entrusted to Tilly.†

The enforcement of the *edict of restitution* was suspended until the meeting of a new diet, which was to be called the following year at Frankfort; at which also the affair of the Dukes of Mecklenburg was to be once more enquired into. While the Emperor Ferdinand hastened, with even imprudent eagerness, to gratify the desires of the states of the empire, the King of Sweden landed on the coasts of Pomerania with his troops, whose discipline and valour made amends for their small number. "With the landing of Gustavus Adolphus in Germany," says Mitchell, "begins the dawning of a new and better era. Not only is the fortune of war changed almost immediately; the mode of conducting it is changed also, *and the voice of humanity is again listened to, even amidst the din of arms.*"‡

The sequel of the history will show how far this remark is founded. Gustavus II (Adolphus) succeeded his father, Charles IX (1611), and ascended the throne of Sweden at the age of seventeen. He is thus described by a Catholic contemporary author:—

"The King, Gustavus Adolphus, is above all remarkable for his prudence, for the richness of his ideas in conversation, for his affability in negotiations, by his courage in enterprises, his diligence in business, in

* Menzel, loc. cit. tom. ii. p. 237-262. Wallenstein shewed to the messengers who brought him his dismissal from the emperor, a horoscope he had drawn of the Emperor Maximilian, and said to them, "You see by the stars that the spirit (*spiritus*) of the Duke of Bavaria is predominating over that of the emperor, and on this account I do not blame the latter." Such was Wallenstein's confidence in astrology, in which he sought reasons for his actions.

† A large number of the 60,000 men who were disbanded, immediately joined the army of Gustavus Adolphus, who had just landed in Pomerania.

‡ Life of Wallenstein, p. 149.

difficult circumstances by his wisdom, in battles by his bravery, in dangers by his intrepidity, on all occasions by his vigilance. In a word he is a prince who knows and understands everything. There never was a general for whom his soldiers felt a higher degree of love and admiration. Heroic actions and efficient services are never forgotten by him."*

Gustavus Adolphus loved war, and had already made it, with as much talent as success, against Denmark, Russia, and Poland. His great ambition was to become master of the Baltic and its coasts; to obtain it he had made war upon Poland, and now attacked Germany. The interests of religion were nothing to him but a pretext for realizing his schemes of conquest.

"Gustavus Adolphus," says Leo, "made the interest of Sweden always his first object, and the plans he had in view in Germany were even more destructive to the constitution of the empire, and more usurping, than those of Denmark. Germany had no need whatever of this foreign interference, and it is only superficial reasoning, dictated by Protestant party spirit, which can pretend that the intervention of Gustavus Adolphus was necessary for the maintenance of Protestantism in Germany."†

Wallenstein's project of creating a naval force upon the Baltic and the northern ocean, threatened the power of this king; and the troops which the general had sent to the assistance of Poland, convinced him that, sooner or later, he should have to fear the intervention of Germany in the affairs of the north. Gustavus Adolphus determined not to wait to be attacked, but to take the offensive; and the disorganized state of Germany facilitated his project.

The intelligence of the King of Sweden's descent upon the coasts of Pomerania, arrived at Ratisbon at the very moment when the states were pressing the emperor to disband his army, and dismiss his general. Blinded by their hatred of Wallenstein, they did not see that they were depriving themselves of the only man able to check the valiant enemy who had invaded the empire. They contented themselves with writing letters to the King of Sweden, to induce him to give up his projects in Germany. But Gustavus, while protesting that he entertained only the most friendly intentions towards the States, treated them, in fact, in all respects like a conqueror. The Duke of Pomerania, Bogislao XIV, refused to enter into alliance with him, considering it inconsistent with his duty to the emperor to do so. Upon this, the King of Sweden ordered him, "as if he had been his

* Gualdo Priorato, in *historia delle guerre di Ferdinando III*, lib. v. p. 127. "Gustavus Rex," says the Pope's nuncio, Caraffa, (*Germania Sacca reformat*, p. 476) "cui parem Suecia nullum, Europa paucos dedit."

† *Handbuch*, tom. iii. p. 389-394.

sovereign and master,"* to come into his camp, and to open the gates of his residence at Stettin to him. He then obliged him to sign a treaty, by which the duke, who had no children, acknowledged the King of Sweden as his successor in his duchy; by which treaty he violated an ancient hereditary agreement between the houses of Pomerania and Brandenburg.† Finding no sympathy amongst the Protestant states of Germany, the King of Sweden concluded a treaty, by which he was to receive subsidies from France for five years.‡ These acts were not calculated to inspire the Protestant princes of the empire with confidence; and, accordingly, they met at Leipsic (1631), and came to the unanimous resolution not to ally themselves with the King of Sweden against the emperor, but to raise an army, and defend their privileges against whatever party should attack them. This resolution irritated Gustavus Adolphus, and especially against the electoral prince of Brandenburg, whose sister he had married. To compel this prince to take his side, he attacked the town of Frankfort on the Oder, carried it by assault, and sacked it. There was an imperial garrison§ in the town, although it belonged to the electoral Prince of Brandenburg. Until now, the Swedes had met but little resistance; for Tilly was occupied in besieging Magdeburg, which, from its situation on the Elbe, became a most important military position. The Protestant inhabitants of that town had already concluded an alliance with Gustavus Adolphus, and their defence was directed by a Swedish officer: all eyes were consequently turned upon the King of Sweden, who had now so good an opportunity of proving to the German Protestants, that he was there to assist them against the forces of the empire. But, instead of saving Magdeburg, Gustavus negotiated with the electoral princes of Brandenburg and Saxony, and required that they should give up their fortresses, and aid him with troops and provisions. At length, the Prince of Brandenburg consented to place the fortress of Spandau in the hands of the Swedes; but it was too late. Tilly had taken Magdeburg, after a murderous combat, which lasted for four hours, in the very streets of the city; where the inhabitants made so obstinate a resistance, as to cost the assailants more than a thousand men. A fire, which broke out in many parts of the town at once, destroyed it almost entirely, in spite of Tilly's efforts to arrest its progress: || nothing was left of this flourishing

* Leo Handbuch, t. iii. p. 392.

† Menzel, loc. cit. t. ii. p. 290.

‡ Geijer Geschichte Schwedens, t. iii. p. 179.

§ "The Swedish army entirely sacked the town, sparing neither the town-house nor any private house," says the contemporary author of the *Inventarium Sueciæ*, t. ii. p. 306, a work which is written in favour of the Swedes.

|| It is from a contemporary author, Wassenburg, *Florus Germanicus*, p. 186, that

town, but the churches and a small number of houses that withstood the flames. The city was dreadfully pillaged* by the soldiers, amongst whom were many Protestants. Some modern authors, and amongst the rest, Schiller, and those who have copied him, like Mitchell, accuse Tilly of the horrors committed by his army at Magdeburg: they have not even hesitated to repeat the absurd and apocryphal story, that Tilly replied to some officers who asked him to spare the town, "Kill and burn a few hours longer, and then I shall see."† A contemporary author, himself a Protestant, assures us that Tilly shed tears on beholding the ruins of the city.‡ "But the tears of the general," says Menzel, "have not attained the same celebrity as those of Xerxes, Scipio, or Titus. It is, certainly, stated in modern histories," continues the same author, "that Tilly gave orders for the plunder and burning of Magdeburg; but all the circumstances, as well as the character of this general, tend fully to refute the assertion."§ Indeed, when we remember the moral condition of an army which has just carried a town by assault, and, moreover, the peculiar composition of armies at that period, we cannot blame Tilly for having been unable to prevent pillage. Gustavus Adolphus could not save Frankfort from being terribly pillaged, although the Protestant inhabitants did not offer the smallest resistance to his troops, who came to deliver them from the imperial garrison. That Tilly should have taken Magdeburg almost in the presence of the Swedish army, which was only a few days' distance from it, was a subject of universal indignation amongst the German Protestants. Gustavus Adolphus found it necessary to publish an apology for his conduct, in which he threw all the blame upon the electoral princes of Brandenburg and Saxony; but these excuses were not credited, and the general opinion, that the King of Sweden might, if he had pleased, have saved Magdeburg, remained unaltered. One of the emperor's most able generals, Pappenheim, who commanded

we learn this fact: the same author, and three others, of whom two are Protestants (*Epitome Rerum Germanicarum*, p. 101, and *P. Winsemias paneg. in Gusta.* Amst. 1632, p. 34), and the third Catholic (*Adelzreiter Annales Boicæ Gentis*, t. iii. p. 16), affirm that the inhabitants themselves set fire to some houses, to stop the plundering of the soldiers.

* *Inventarium Sueciæ*, t. ii. p. 311.

† Schiller *Geschichte des Dreissigjährigen Krieges*: Mitchell, *Life of Wallenstein*, pp. 181-184. The same story is told by the author of a work called "The Swedish Soldier," which is little deserving of credit: however, the author has been at the pains to add, "*If this is true*,"—a proviso which modern authors have not taken the trouble to insert. Menzel, loc. cit. t. ii. p. 304, in the note.

‡ *Certe Tillius collucentem late urbem, cumulosque casorum et manantes tabo vicos obequitans, illacrymasse visus est*: Brachelius *historiarum nostri temporis*, lib. iv. p. 254.

§ *Geschichte des Dreissigjährigen Krieges*, t. ii. pp. 304, 305.

under Tilly, was of the same opinion ; for, in a letter which he addressed to the Duke of Bavaria, after the taking of Frankfort by the Swedes, he assures him, “that if the King of Sweden should continue his march, the imperial army would be forced to raise the siege of Magdeburg.”*

The electoral Prince of Brandenburg demanded back the fortress of Spandau, which he had ceded to the King of Sweden, in order to facilitate his march upon Magdeburg. Gustavus did, indeed, evacuate it ; but he marched to Berlin, and forced the prince, by a threat of cannonading the city, to give up to him Spandau and Kustrin, and to pay him 60,000 crowns a month, as a subsidy to maintain the war. After this violent conduct towards an independent prince, who was, moreover, his brother-in-law, Gustavus Adolphus occupied Mecklenburg, driving out the imperial troops and the persons whom Wallenstein had appointed to the public offices, and re-established the two exiled dukes, on the condition of their owning him as their sovereign.† The Duke George of Lunenburg, the Landgrave William V, of Hesse Cassel, and the valiant Duke Bernhard de Weimar, then joined his cause : this latter prince, the youngest of eight brothers, hoped, by the assistance of Gustavus Adolphus, to obtain possession of some ecclesiastical territories.‡ This was his real reason for taking part in the war, during which he distinguished himself by his military talents and his courage.§ The electoral Prince of Saxony remained faithful to his plan of observing a strict neutrality. He had raised an army of 18,000 men, and given the command of it to Arnim, the ancient general and friend of Wallenstein, who had quitted the service of the emperor after his expedition into Poland.

The emperor, who feared that the Elector of Saxony would, in the end, be obliged, whether he would or not, to make common cause with Gustavus Adolphus, summoned him to unite his troops with his, to resist the farther progress of the Swedes. But John George, who had hitherto rejected all the King of Sweden’s invitations to conclude an alliance with him, refused to accede to the demands of Ferdinand. The fear of a junction between the Saxons and the Swedes, together with a total want of provisions, made Tilly at length determine to invade Saxony, which had not as yet suffered from the war. Irritated by this

* *Theatrum Europæum*, t. ii. p. 352. Menzel, loc. cit. t. ii. p. 311.

† *Leo Handbuch*, t. iii. p. 397.

‡ Menzel, loc. cit. t. ii. p. 326.

§ A very good biography of this prince has lately been published in Germany, by B. Roesch : *Herzog Bernhard der Grosse von Sachsen-Weimar*. Weimar, 1828, 1829, 2 vols. 8vo.

step, John George called the King of Sweden to his assistance. After joining the Saxon army, Gustavus attacked Tilly between Leipsic and Breitenfeld, and completely defeated him. The results of this victory were immense. All the Austrian provinces were left defenceless, and there was nothing to prevent the conqueror from carrying his victorious arms to the very gates of Vienna. The greater part of the Protestant states of the empire followed the example of the Elector of Saxony, and embraced the cause of the King of Sweden, who thus became in some sort the chief of all the Protestant party of Germany. Gustavus Adolphus thought the moment was come when he might throw off the mask, and openly avow his real intentions. The electoral Prince of Saxony had promised him his vote to elect him King of the Romans,* and the King of Sweden no longer affected to conceal that the throne of Germany was the ultimate end of his ambition.† But to establish his power upon a secure foundation, he meant to secularize the ecclesiastical territories of Magdeburg, Halberstadt, Mayence, Würzburg, Bamberg, and Spire; to add to these a part of the Palatinate, and thus to compose a new state, which should embrace the whole of central Germany.‡ “It is evident,” says Leo, “that Gustavus Adolphus made war for the interests of Sweden and not of Germany.§

Those views of the King of Sweden’s explain to us why, after the battle of Leipsic, he directed his march towards the Rhine, instead of invading Bohemia and Austria. He wished first to make himself master of Germany, from whence he might give laws to Ferdinand, who, had he been attacked in his capital, would have opposed to him the same unshaken firmness with which he had triumphed over the Bohemians. Leaving it to the Saxons to prosecute the war with the emperor, the King of Sweden turned towards the west. The towns of Erfurt, Würzburg, Aschaffenburg, Hanau, Mayence, and Mannheim, fell into his power; some opened their gates, others were carried by storm. The citadel of Würzburg, which had defended itself bravely, was sacked; and more than twenty Catholic priests were murdered by the soldiers at the foot of the altars.||

* This was the title of the intended successor to the imperial throne.

† The testimony of two contemporary and Protestant authors, De Puffendorff, *Commentario de rebus Suecicis*, lib. iii. sec. 31, and of the author of the *Theatrum Europæum*, t. ii. p. 592, has been cited by Menzel, loc. cit. t. ii. p. 321, in the note.

‡ Gustavus Adolphus often spoke of it himself during his first stay at Nuremberg: see Breyer *Beiträge zur Geschichte des Dreissigjährigen Krieges*. München, 1811, t. i. p. 210; and Leo *Handbuch*, t. iii. pp. 400, 401. It is inconceivable how Mitchell (*Life of Wallenstein*, p. 271) can say, “the proofs necessary to substantiate this charge, are totally wanting.” This passage proves the trifling character of the author’s labours.

§ Leo, loc. cit.

|| Menzel, loc. cit. t. ii. p. 325.

In all these towns, Gustavus forced the inhabitants to do him homage as to their sovereign. It was in vain that the Prince Palatine, Frederic V, demanded Manheim and the Palatinate from the proud conqueror. Gustavus treated him with disdain, and returned an evasive answer.* He had determined also to give to his chancellor Oxenstiern, the dignity of electoral prince of Mayence, after having secularized† this bishopric, in order to have another vote at his disposal when his election as King of the Romans should be decided. In the meanwhile, the Saxon army had entered Bohemia, and threatened from thence Moravia and Austria. The emperor who had no army, nor any means to raise one, took the advice of the majority of his council, and addressed himself to Wallenstein, with whom he had kept up a close correspondence, and who, since his dismissal, had lived at Prague, or on his estates in Bohemia, surrounded by an almost royal court.

He had taken no part in public affairs, but he had attentively observed the march of events; and doubtless it had not escaped his acuteness that the time was approaching when the emperor must have recourse to his talents, and when he must receive a full reparation for the injustice that had been done to him. It is very possible that he might smile at the progress made by Gustavus, and the reverses of Tilly, although there is no proof that is satisfactory of the truth of an accusation made against him at a later period, that he had entered into secret negotiations with the King of Sweden, in order to overturn the throne of Ferdinand.‡ When the Saxon army had taken Prague, the emperor charged Wallenstein to negotiate with Arnim, in order to break, if possible, the alliance that had been concluded between the electoral prince of Saxony and Gustavus Adolphus. At the same time, the emperor entreated Wallenstein to resume the command of the imperial troops:—he refused at first, but urged by the pressing letters of the emperor, he yielded at length. Understanding, however, that he was to hold the command under the imperial prince Ferdinand, eldest son of the emperor, he declined it, but offered to raise an army of 40,000 or 50,000 men, and

* Moser *Patriotisches Archiv*, t. vii. p. 179. The conditions which Gustavus wished to impose upon Frederic were so hard, that the latter rejected them.

† Leo *Handbuch*, t. iii. pp. 403-404.

‡ These accusations are to be found in the *procès* of Wallenstein, published by order of the emperor: and they have been repeated by Khevenhüller *Annales Ferdinandæ*, t. xii. pp. 1110-1116. Foerster, (*Wallenstein's Briefe*, t. ii. pp. 128-179) has endeavoured to refute them. But it is remarkable that the report of this secret intercourse between Gustavus and Wallenstein, had already gained ground at this period, and had even been inserted in the French journals. See the letter from Tilly to Wallenstein, dated the 21st February, 1631, and the reply of the latter, dated the 14th March, in Foerster, *loc. cit.* pp. 149-152.

to command it for three months. And such was the renown of this general, that soldiers flocked from all sides to his standard; and at the end of three months he was, in fact, at the head of an army of 40,000 men. But it was evident, that only he who raised these troops would be able to command them; and being again solicited by the emperor, Wallenstein accepted the office of commander-in-chief, with an almost independent power. The following are the chief conditions of Wallenstein's service to the emperor:—the Duke of Friedland was named generalissimo of the house of Austria and the crown of Spain; the emperor was not to join the army in person, and could not issue any orders to it; a safe conduct, or a pardon granted by the emperor, was to be of no value without the confirmation of the generalissimo; in return for his services, the Duke of Friedland was to obtain one of the Austrian provinces, with all the rights of a prince of the empire of the highest class. In any future treaty of peace, Wallenstein's interest in the Duchy of Mecklenburg was to be taken into consideration, and the hereditary states of the emperor were to be open to the generalissimo, and to his army, in case of a retreat.* Wallenstein has been often blamed for exacting such exorbitant conditions from the emperor; but the intrigues to which he had once already been a victim, and the number of enemies he had, even in the imperial court, may in some degree excuse him. But on the other hand it cannot be denied, that these conditions were a proof of this general's great ambition—an ambition which tempted him to form guilty schemes, and in the end occasioned his ruin. It was towards the end of April, 1632, that Wallenstein was again placed at the head of the imperial army, and in less than six weeks, without giving them battle, he had forced the Saxons to evacuate Bohemia. While he reaped fresh laurels, his old adversary, Duke Maximilian, was driven to extremity by the victories of the King of Sweden. This prince had passed the winter on the borders of the Rhine, where he seized upon a number of small towns, until the advance of Tilly forced him to turn his arms against Bavaria. After the battle of Leipsic, Tilly increased his army to the number of 20,000 men, and marched to the assistance of the bishop of Bamberg; but the arrival of Gustavus Adolphus with a larger force, compelled him to retreat upon the river Seck, in order to defend Bavaria. The Swedish army forced the passage of the river, and Tilly, who had been dangerously hurt, threw himself with his army into Ingolstadt, where he died of the consequences of his wound. Gustavus Adolphus attacked this fortress, but

* Khevenhüller *Annales Ferdinandæ*, t. xii. p. 15.

finding that he could not take it, seized upon Augsburg, obliged the inhabitants to swear fealty to him, and from thence proceeded to Munich, the residence of Duke Maximilian, which he entered on the 7th of May, 1632. Wallenstein at first took no step to save Bavaria; and Maximilian determined to go in person and solicit aid from the general he had so grievously offended. The two princes were reconciled; "nevertheless," says a contemporary writer, "those who were present at this interview, believed they could observe that the Duke of Bavaria was a greater proficient in the art of dissimulation than the Duke of Friedland."* The union of the imperial army with that of the League, forced Gustavus to quit Bavaria and retire to Nuremberg, where the inhabitants were devoted to his cause. Wallenstein followed him, and entrenched himself in a fortified camp upon the heights of Fürth, at two leagues from Nuremberg. The two great generals of their time were thus for the first time opposed to each other, and a decisive battle was expected. Gustavus's army was superior in numbers, but Wallenstein had an advantage over his adversary in the position of his camp, which cut off the supply of provision from the enemy. After six weeks, the King of Sweden, no longer able to remain at Nuremberg, attacked Wallenstein's lines, but was repulsed with great loss. In despair of making his enemy abandon so secure a position, he quitted Nuremberg and marched again towards Bavaria, whither he was followed by Maximilian. Wallenstein took the direction of Saxony, in order to force the electoral prince to abandon his Swedish alliance. The elector summoned Gustavus Adolphus to his assistance, who attacked Wallenstein near Lützen, on the 6th of November, 1632: the battle was a most bloody one, and the King of Sweden having advanced too far, was killed by several of the enemies' balls.† Duke Bernhard de Weimar decided the fortunes of the day in favour of the Swedes.

While we acknowledge the distinguished qualities of the King of Sweden, we must avow that his death was a great blessing to Germany, which this foreign conqueror would have deprived of its independence. Mitchell goes too far in his eulogiums of this prince, and in placing him far above Louis XIV, and Napoleon. This author's predilection for Gustavus makes him guilty of great injustice to Napoleon in particular, who was certainly one of the greatest generals in modern times. "A ruthless conscription placed hundreds of thousands of brave and intelligent

* Khevenhüller *Annales Ferdinandeæ*, t. xii. p. 24.

† Modern enquirers have fully proved that Gustavus Adolphus did not fall a victim to the treason of one of his officers, as was the prevailing opinion for some time: Geijer *Geschichte von Schweden*, t. iii. p. 233.

soldiers at his command, and the victories which he purchased with their blood, dazzled the world, who in its ready admiration of imperial sway, willingly overlooked *the meanness of his character, and the insignificance of his talents.*"* The Prince Palatine Frederic V, who had acted so unenviable a part in this war, died thirteen days after Gustavus Adolphus, without having recovered possession of his states. Ferdinand showed the greatest moderation on hearing of the death of his most formidable enemy: "Let us continue to be humble of heart (said he, to those who congratulated him upon it,) and to commend this business to God."† And Pope Urban caused a low mass to be said. The loss of the two parties at Lützen had been nearly equal; but Wallenstein, by quitting Saxony, and taking up his winter quarters in Bohemia, acknowledged himself defeated. The death of Gustavus Adolphus had deprived the Protestant party in Germany of its chief; for this prince left only a daughter of seven years old—Christiana; and the emperor had every right to expect, that the war which had lasted already twelve years, would be brought to a termination. These hopes were frustrated by two circumstances; on the one hand the activity displayed by the Swedish Chancellor, Axel Oxenstiern, one of the most able statesmen of his time: on the other, the ambitious projects of Wallenstein, who wished to be the sole director of German affairs, and to turn this power to his own advantage. After the death of Gustavus Adolphus, the war in Germany changed its character entirely. It was chiefly upheld by the two foreign powers of Sweden and France, who continued it for their own benefit. Sweden would not abandon the conquests that Gustavus had made in Germany, and France strove to enfeeble the house of Austria. Amongst the German Princes who attached themselves to the cause of Sweden, the Dukes Bernard of Weimar, and George of Lunenburg, considered the war as a means of existence: Duke William of Weimar, and the Landgrave William of Hesse, received pensions from the crown of France. The electoral princes of Saxony, and of Brandenburg, remained the allies of Sweden, but in some degree, in spite of themselves; for they detested the Swedes, and were constantly negotiating with the emperor. These two princes took no part in the meeting at Heilbron, where Oxenstiern succeeded

* Life of Wallenstein, p. 273.

† Larmormain Speculum Theopoliticum, ch. xvii. p. 93. Mitchell loc. cit. 276, 277, accuses the emperor of having shown on this occasion an unmeasured joy. But the author does not support his opinion by any authority, and it is evident that it was instilled into him by that party spirit which is displayed in every page of his work.

in concluding an alliance between the Protestant States of the two circles of the Rhine; and of Franconia and Swabia, on the one part, and Sweden on the other. The Swedish Chancellor was entrusted with the chief management of affairs, and he increased his power by treaties with France, Holland, and England. In this division amongst his enemies, the emperor might have found a noble opportunity to put an end to the war. His own plan was to oblige the Electors of Saxony and Brandenburg, by dint of negotiations, to abandon the Swedish cause, to drive these invaders from German ground, and then to compel the other German princes to lay down their arms. But his hands were tied; he could not dispose of his military power, without the consent of Wallenstein, who was the sovereign of his army; and whose views were not the same as his own. Yet circumstances were now much in favour of the Imperial general, who was at this time at the head of 40,000 men, over whom he exercised an absolute sway; while the forces of the enemy were led by many generals, more or less independent of each other. Duke Bernhard, and under him, the Swedish general Horn, led the chief army, and continued the war in Franconia, and the south of Germany. Duke George of Lunenburg, together with the Swedish General Kniphausen, was at the head of a division in Lower Saxony and Westphalia. These two princes were not inclined to pay much attention to the orders of the Swedish Chancellor, who had only a small army under his influence, under the command of Banner, which was stationed in the territories of Magdeburg and Halberstadt; and the Saxon army, under the command of Arnim, dependent still less upon the Chancellor, although the exiled Bohemian, the Count de Thurn, had joined it with 6,000 Swedes. After the death of his formidable enemy, Wallenstein seems to have aspired to becoming independent, and to playing the part of arbiter in Germany,—to dictate conditions of peace to the foreign powers, to the princes of the empire, and the emperor. We are induced to believe this from an attentive consideration of his actions, from the battle of Lützen until his death. While the Protestant armies were actively following up the advantages they had derived from the victory of Lützen, Wallenstein remained in Bohemia until the month of May 1633. Duke Bernhard threatened Bavaria with a new invasion; George of Lunenburg took Harnelm, and many other important towns in the north of Germany; and the Saxon army conquered the whole of Silesia. Wallenstein, who had orders from the emperor to negotiate with the electoral-princes of Saxony and Brandenburg, took the opportunity of opening a correspondence with France. For this purpose he

employed chiefly one of his most intimate friends, the Count de Kinsky, who lived at Dresden, and commenced an intercourse with M. de Feuquières, the ambassador from France to the electoral-princes of Saxony; yet he was careful not to compromise himself, by committing any thing to writing, or by entrusting his schemes to General Arnim, who, as well as his sovereign, leaned to the emperor's side.* About the beginning of May, Wallenstein marched to Silesia, but instead of attacking the enemy, who could only have opposed him with 20,000 men at the most, he passed four weeks in marching and counter-marching, and at last concluded a truce of a fortnight with Arnim. In an interview with this general, Wallenstein expressed his wish for a general peace with Sweden, and with Saxony and Brandenburg; complained of the Duke of Bavaria, and the Jesuits, who he said were his greatest enemies at Court; and threw out hints that it was his intention to seize upon the crown of Bohemia.† The Count de Kinsky, had already made M. de Feuquières aware of Wallenstein's intentions; adding that Wallenstein was treating on the same subject with the Swedish chancellor, through the intervention of the Count de Thurn, who commanded a body of Swedish troops in the Saxon army.‡ But Oxenstiern had an acuteness of mind, and a clearness of political views, no ways inferior to Wallenstein's, and which was fatal to these plans. The chancellor penetrated his real designs, and advised the Count de Thurn not to be deceived by the Duke of Friedland, and neither to hasten the negotiations, nor to advance too far without giving him notice of it;§ and in this he was right, for Wallenstein hated the Swedes, and would have rejoiced in an opportunity to sow discord between them and the German princes, and to make his own profit by it. At all events he kept the court of Vienna in ignorance of these negotiations with France and Sweden,—a clear proof of the guilt of his designs. In his letters to the emperor, he speaks only of his hope soon to conclude a favourable peace with Saxony, that he may

* Letter from Feuquières to Richelieu, dated 17th June, 1633, in the Letters of Feuquières, t. i. p. 225. Fœrster would have it, that the Count de Kinsky acted in this business on his own account, and not by the authority of Wallenstein; but the great intimacy of these two men refutes this crafty excuse, by which the author has sought to justify the man whose defence he has undertaken.

† *Theatrum Europæum*, t. iii. p. 74. *Puffendorf Commentaria de rebus Suecicis*, lib. v. § 53. *Khevenhüller Annales Ferdinandeæ*, t. xii. p. 578. *Bukisch Religions-moten*, t. v. p. 980. Menzel has clearly proved that these words of Wallenstein have not been circulated only since his death, as his defenders have asserted.

‡ *Memoirs of Richelieu*, t. viii. p. 335. Letter from Louis XIII to M. de Feuquières, 19th June, 1633, t. i. p. 258. The Swedish historian Chemnitz, who wrote the *Memoirs of Oxenstiern*, tells the same story. *Schwedischer Knig. in Deutschland*, Stockholm, 1653, t. ii. p. 154.

§ Chemnitz, loc. cit.

then drive the Swedes from the German territory.* The French, jealous of the increasing influence of Sweden, made great efforts to come to a conclusion with Wallenstein. M. de Feuquières addressed two letters to him, and although he received no answer, he continued to make him great offers, through the medium of the Count de Kinsky, who, in the name of the Duke of Friedland, had put several questions to him respecting an alliance with France. Feuquières sent these questions to Paris, and received an official reply, dated the 16th July, 1633, in which amongst other things, it was said, "that if the Duke of Friedland would conclude a treaty, by which he would oblige himself to keep on foot an army of 30,000 foot soldiers, and 4 or 5,000 cavalry, wherewith to oppose the designs of the house of Austria, his Majesty would bind himself to pay him one million of francs yearly."† This reply was accompanied by an autograph letter from Louis XIII, to the Duke of Friedland, which was couched in the most general terms, that it might do no harm in case it should fall into other hands. In the meanwhile the inactivity of Wallenstein, which surprised every one, had been enquired into by his numerous enemies at the court of Vienna. Intrigues were renewed against him, and it was probably to triumph over his adversaries, that Wallenstein renewed hostilities in Silesia, the day after the conclusion of the armistice, (the 23d June 1633.) But after an attempt at surprising the fortress of Schweidnitz, which failed, he entrenched himself in the mountains, between Silesia and Bohemia, and remained inactive during eight weeks. At length he concluded a new armistice for four weeks, with Arnim, and the Count de Thurn.‡

Wallenstein had neither replied to the communications of M. de Feuquières, nor to the letter of king Louis XIII, so that the French ambassador no longer knew on what terms he stood with him. When, in the month of August, on his return from Berlin to Dresden, the Count de Kinsky came to him, and in Wallenstein's name, inquired if the French cabinet was still disposed to treat with him on the same terms as formerly, Feuquières, who began to distrust the Duke of Friedland, gave an evasive answer, and nothing farther was done. The conduct of Wallenstein became more and more enigmatical to all who were concerned with him. If we may believe an assertion which De Kinsky made to

* Schmidt, *Geschichte der Deutschen*, t. x. p. 149. It is singular, that M. Fœrster in Wallenstein's Correspondence, which he has published, has inserted none of the letters which this general exchanged with the emperor during the whole year 1633.

† Feuquières letters, t. ii. p. 1.

‡ Fœrster, *Wallenstein's Briefe*, t. ii. p. 50.

De Feuquières, at a later period, the only reason why Wallenstein did not declare openly against the emperor, was the fear of being abandoned by a part of his officers.* However this may be, he shewed the same indecision in his conduct to Arnim, who had gone in person to communicate to Oxenstiern the propositions that Wallenstein had made to him, at the conclusion of the last armistice. "The Duke of Friedland," said the Saxon general, "has determined to be revenged on the emperor, for the insult offered to him three years ago, if only he could be secure of the support of the Protestant states. He believes that he can depend upon the greater part of his officers; and has concluded this armistice, in order that he may enter into communication with the Swedish chancellor. His plan would be to march to Bohemia, and from thence to attack Austria and Styria, while Duke Bernhard de Weimar should march against Bavaria, and the Swedish general Horn against the Spaniards, who, under the command of the Duke de Feria, had entered the south of Germany from Italy." The chancellor gave no credit to the communications of Arnim, whom he suspected on account of his old connexion with Wallenstein. "He, however, informed the Duke of Weimar of the whole affair, advising him not to be deceived by the Duke of Friedland," but to wait for what he calls "his real demonstration." At the same time, he sent an officer into Silesia to acquire more ample information, and to assure Wallenstein of his assistance, if he were really inclined to turn against the emperor.† The historian of the Emperor Ferdinand tells us, that the chancellor entrusted to one Bubna, a Bohemian exile, written propositions to Wallenstein, who, after having read them, said aloud to the bearer of the letter, "This chancellor is a reasonable man,—these proposals are excellent; but it is not yet time. When it is time, I will do it all."‡ In these words, if Wallenstein really made use of them, we may perceive another motive for his indecision. He thought he could tell by his astrological calculations that the time for acting was not arrived; and in fact, he again broke off all negotiations.

When Arnim returned to Silesia, after the journey he had taken to see Oxenstiern, Wallenstein proposed that they should form an alliance to drive the Swedes from the empire, in the first place; and when the Saxon general expressed his astonishment at this proposition,§ he sent him word that he would com-

* Feuquières' Letters, t. ii. p. 211.

† Chemnitz, loc. cit. Roese Bernhard da Grosse, t. i. p. 246.

‡ Khevenhüller, Annales Ferdinandæ, t. xii. p. 1122.

§ Arnim's Letters to the Electoral Prince of Brandenburg, in Förster, t. iii. pp. 72, 75.

mence hostilities on the 1st of the following October. Appearing as if he would invade Saxony, he deceived his enemies, who divided their forces. Arnim marched towards Dresden, and the Count de Thurn, who remained with 6000 men in Silesia, was surprised by Wallenstein, and forced to surrender unconditionally, with his arms and baggage. Against all expectation, he restored Thurn to liberty, thereby increasing the suspicions which were now entertained against him at Vienna; but the presence of Thurn, whom he had employed in his negotiations with Oxenstiern, would undoubtedly have compromised him at court. After this *coup-de-main*, he drove the enemy from Silesia, and advanced into Lusatia, while a detached body of troops under Terzka ravaged Brandenburg, and levied a contribution upon Berlin.* But while he followed up his triumph over the enemy, Wallenstein saw with pleasure the progress made in Bavaria by Duke Bernhard de Weimar and General Horn. The imperial general, Aldringer, who also commanded the Bavarian troops, had been forced to fall back upon the Izor; and Wallenstein consented, after reiterated entreaties from the emperor and the Duke Maximilian, to send him some reinforcements, but with the strictest orders to hold himself on the defensive.† The consequences of these orders were most vexatious; for Eichstedt, and part of the palatinate, fell into the power of the enemy. At length, the rapid progress of the Swedes determined the emperor to ask for the assistance of Philip IV of Spain. A Spanish army was assembled at Milan, under the orders of the Duke de Feria, and was from thence to march into the south of Germany. No sooner had Wallenstein learnt this, than he sent Colonel Diodate to the Cardinal-Infant, Ferdinand, brother of the king of Spain, to desire that Feria should not enter Germany, because, he said, the arrival of foreign troops might occasion the breaking-off of the peace which he was on the point of concluding.‡ Wallenstein had never been farther from attaining this object than at this time, and the pretext was but a poor disguise of his fear of the arrival of an army, which might weaken his influence at the court of Vienna. When the Spanish army had crossed the Alps in spite of him, he refused, at first, to give orders to Aldringer to

* Wallenstein's Letters to the Count de Gallas, dated 12th October, 1633, in Fœrster, t. iii. p. 81, 82.

† He repeated these orders to Aldringer at the very time when he was writing to the emperor that he had left this general to act according to his discretion. Fœrster and Mitchell (who, in this part of his work, has only copied from Fœrster) do not mention these heavy charges which are brought against Wallenstein in the official recital of his process. It must be presumed that these authors have found no documents which can disprove it.

‡ Schmidt, Geschichte der Deutschen, t. x. p. 154.

join him; and when he yielded to the emperor's desire, he sent him secret orders to cross the designs of his new allies.*

The Duke de Feria wished to march against the Swedes, and to give them battle near Dutlingen, on the Danube; but when this plan was discussed in a council of war, Aldringer opposed it, and succeeded in persuading the Spanish general, who had no great military talent, to abandon this project, and to march towards the Rhine.† Duke Bernhard de Weimar profited by the false steps of the enemy, to besiege Ratisbon. Again the Duke of Bavaria entreated Wallenstein to send him 5000 men, and the emperor dispatched seven couriers, one after another, urging him to send a reinforcement under the command of Gallas to Ratisbon.‡ But Wallenstein, who saw the success of the Duke of Weimar with pleasure, threw no obstacle in his way; and the Swedes took Ratisbon, Straubing, and some other towns, threatening, on the one hand, Munich, and, on the other, Passau and Linz. Alarmed for the safety of Austria, the emperor demanded help in the most energetic terms, and Wallenstein quitted Lusatia, at length, in the month of November, and encamped for some time at Furth, near Nuremberg. But instead of continuing his route, he retraced his steps, and took up his winter quarters in Bohemia. The emperor tried at first to prevail with him to choose other quarters; but he allowed himself to be persuaded by Wallenstein's reasons, and wrote him a most obliging letter, informing him that he had sent him 100,000 florins from his private treasure, and a large quantity of provisions which he had collected for him in Austria and Hungary.§

This letter was of a kind to set Wallenstein's mind at rest respecting the emperor's sentiments towards him; but instead of its turning him from his ambitious projects, he resumed them the more actively, as he now felt secure that his negotiations with Sweden and France had not transpired. While the Count de Kinsky was informing De Feuquières, in a letter dated the 1st January, 1634, that there was nothing now to prevent the execution of the treaty between France and the Duke of Friedland,|| Wallenstein, on the other hand, was trying to gain over to his purposes the generals of his army, and to make sure of the subal-

* Gualdo, *Historia delle Guerre*, p. 175; Schmidt, *loc. cit.*

† Gualdo, *loc. cit.* p. 176, 177.

‡ Schmidt, *loc. cit.*; Chemnitz, *loc. cit.* t. ii. p. 335. Fœrster does not mention these facts, which have nevertheless a most suspicious appearance against Wallenstein.

§ This Letter is dated the 3rd January, 1634, in Fœrster, *Wallenstein's Briefe*, t. iii. p. 142, 144.

|| See Count Kinsky's Letter, and De Feuquières's reply to it, in Fœrster, t. iii. p. 448-450.

tern officers. The first person to whom he communicated his plans was the Count Piccolomini, an Italian by birth, in whom he had great confidence; but this general, while he feigned to approve of the plans suggested to him, was the first to sound an alarm at Vienna. Wallenstein next convoked, on the 11th January, a meeting of all the chief officers of the regiments at his head-quarters at Pilsen; and in order to sound their dispositions towards him, he caused it to be announced to them by General Illo, his friend and confidant, that he intended to leave the service of the emperor, on account of the *injustice with which he was treated at court*. Illo prevailed with the officers to entreat the general to remain at the head of the army, by representing the ill consequences his resignation would have for them. A deputation waited upon Wallenstein, who, after some hesitation, promised them not to forsake the army. Illo and Terzka pressed the officers to sign a document they had drawn up, in which they bound themselves, by an oath, to “remain faithful to the Duke of Friedland, until the last drop of their blood, *so long as he continued in the service of the emperor*.” This document was signed at a banquet given to the officers, in the course of which confusion and disputes had arisen, on account of the refusal of some of the guests to affix their names. Wallenstein’s enemies afterwards asserted that the copy of the document offered for signature at the banquet, did not contain the last clause; but as this fact was not alleged on the trial which, at a later period, took place of some of the officers who signed the paper, the question must remain in doubt.*

Wallenstein having heard of these disputes, called a meeting of his officers on the following day,—restored to them the document they had signed,—and again declared to them that he should leave the army. They entreated him to pardon what had taken place the day before,—signed several copies of the document,—and insisted upon it that he should not resign.† These facts, the truth of which cannot be contested, have a strong appearance of guilt. “If,” says Menzel, “Wallenstein did not conceal under these actions any projects hostile to the emperor,—if he really intended only to lay down the command of the army, as at this period he so often said he should,—there is no conceivable reason for his forming, through his friends, such an association amongst his officers; or why did he not put a stop to it, so soon as it became known to him, if his confidants had acted without his authority?”‡ Wallenstein was altogether silent upon the subject

* Förster, Wallenstein's Briefe, t. iii. p. 147-151.

† Khevenhüller, Annales Ferd. tom. xii. p. 1140.

‡ Dreissigjähriger Krieges, t. ii. p. 400.

in his letters to the emperor, who heard of these events at Pilsen from Aldringer and Piccolomini. Ferdinand had been slow to credit the accusations brought against his generalissimo; but he yielded at length to the solicitations of his council, and of the Spanish ambassador, Ognate, and on the 27th January signed letters-patent, by which he transferred the command of the army to Count Gallas, at the same time granting pardon to all the officers who had joined the association at Pilsen, except Wallenstein, Illo, and Terzka. Gallas, at the same time, received an order to arrest these three persons, that they might take their trial; or if this were impossible, to seize upon them alive or dead.* The existence of these letters-patent was kept a profound secret, and the emperor did not interrupt his correspondence with Wallenstein. The advocates of the latter have charged this to Ferdinand as a crime; but when we remember his uncertainty as to the disposition of the army, and also the unlimited power with which Wallenstein was invested, it must be owned that the most ordinary prudence required that he should act with great precaution, and not too soon awaken the suspicion of this general. Gallas was at Pilsen when he received the charge to execute these orders. Wallenstein had at first no suspicion that the emperor was informed of his projects; and thinking himself secure of his army, he actively continued his negotiations with France.† At the same time, he made overtures to Duke Francis Albert of Lunenburg, who had arrived at Pilsen, deputed by the electoral princes of Saxony and Brandenburg, to negotiate a peace with the emperor.

The departure of Gallas, followed immediately by that of Piccolomini, who joined Aldringer at Linz, gave the first alarm to Wallenstein, who was soon informed of the letters patent issued against him. He immediately sent the Duke of Lunenburg to the Duke Bernhard de Weimar, to desire him to draw towards Bohemia, and effect a junction with him;‡ at the same time, he gave the necessary orders for concentrating his army at Prague by the 23rd February. On the 20th of the same month, he made his principal officers sign a protestation that he had never entertained any designs hostile to the emperor: but it was too late. On the 18th February, fresh letters patent were issued against him: and the majority of his army had already been gained for the emperor, by Generals Gallas, Piccolomini, Aldringer, Maradas, and Suys. Suys made himself master of Prague; and Wallenstein's only chance was to draw towards the

* Fœrster, loc. cit. t. iii. p. 177-179.

† Feuquières' Letters, t. ii. p. 211.

‡ Chemnitz, t. ii. p. 335.

frontiers of Bohemia, and join Duke Bernhard, with such of his troops as had remained faithful to him. He went from Pilsen to Eger, accompanied by Illo, Terzka, Kinsky, and some other officers; but Colonel Gordon, the commandant of this town, conspired against him, with Butler and Leslie, and killed him with his partisans, on the night of the 24th-25th February. Without undertaking to justify this violent action, it must, at least, be acknowledged, that Wallenstein had been guilty of high treason, and that he did not fall, as some modern authors have asserted, a victim to perfidious intrigues: nor can the emperor be accused of cruelty and injustice, in giving orders to seize, alive or dead, the person of a general whom all his contemporaries accused of high treason, and against whom there were the heaviest suspicions. "The mildest sovereigns of our days," says Menzel, "would certainly not think themselves obliged to keep any measures with a general who was secretly intriguing with a foreign power, and, still more, a hostile power."*

The events which immediately followed the death of Wallenstein, place the guilt of his conduct after the battle of Lützen in a still more striking point of view. The imperial army, under the command of Ferdinand, the emperor's son, was everywhere victorious. It retook Ratisbon; and gained a brilliant victory over Duke Bernhard and General Horn, near Noerdlingen (1634). All Swabia and Franconia fell into the power of the emperor. In spite of the renewal of the alliance between Sweden and France, and the arrival of a French army on the banks of the Rhine, the imperial troops took Augsburg and Philipsburg, and made a prisoner of the Archbishop of Trêves, who had espoused the French side. At the same time, the emperor resumed his negotiations with the electoral Prince of Saxony, and concluded a peace with him at Prague, on the 30th May, 1635; to which peace the electoral Prince of Brandenburg gave in his accession, on the 27th August, in the same year. Duke George of Lunenburg had done the same on the 29th July, having quitted the service of Sweden. Shortly afterwards, the Dukes of Mecklenburg, the towns of Erfurt and Frankfort, the Protestant states of the circle of Lower Saxony, and the Hanseatic Towns, abandoned the cause of the two foreign powers; and France and Sweden had no longer any allies amongst the Protestant states of the empire, except the Landgrave of Hesse Cassel, the Duke of Wurtemberg, the Margrave of Baden, and Prince Bernhard of Weimar. All these successes the emperor had obtained in less than two years, without any ex-

* Dreissigjæhrigen Kriegen, t. ii. p. 409.

traordinary efforts, and with only the same troops that had been united under the command of Wallenstein. Yet the war lasted for thirteen years longer; thanks to the activity of those two implacable enemies of the House of Austria, Cardinal Richelieu and the Swedish chancellor Oxenstiern; and the power and prosperity of Germany were so reduced by it, that, for more than a century, it could not recover from these disasters.*

From this state of degradation, Wallenstein might, perhaps, have saved his country, if he had honestly employed for this purpose those talents which have placed him so high upon the list of the most eminent captains and distinguished statesmen of Europe.

ART. VII.—*Voyages, Relations, et Mémoires Originaux pour servir à l'Histoire de la Découverte de l'Amérique.* Publiés pour la première fois en Français par H. Ternaux-Compans. 6 tom. 8vo. Paris. 1837. Contenant: 1. *Relation véridique de la Conquête du Pérou et de la province du Cuzco, nommée Nouvelle Castille.* Par François Xerèz. 2. *Histoire de la Province de Santa Cruz.* Par Pero de Magalhanes de Gandavo. 3. *Commentaires d'Alvar Nunez Cabeça de Vaca, Adelentado et Gouverneur du Rio de la Plata.* 4. *Histoire d'un Pays situé dans le Nouveau Monde, nommé Amérique.* Par Hans Staden, de Homberg en Hesse. 5. *Narration du Premier Voyage de Nicolas Federmann, le jeune, d'Ulm.* 6. *Histoire véritable d'un Voyage Curieux, fait par Ulrich Schmidel, de Straubing.*

THE publication of the above works, which, if intended to be as comprehensive as the subject requires, would be only the commencement of an extensive series, affords us a suitable opportunity of introducing the ancient Peruvians to the British public; and of correcting, in reference to the Spanish conquest of that people, some fallacies that during three centuries have misled our countrymen,—fallacies that the celebrated history of Robertson has not tended to remove. We select Peru from the

* When we study the account of this war in the historians of the times, and of all its disastrous consequences to Germany, it is impossible to adopt the opinion of Wallenstein's biographer, respecting the wholesomeness of its influence upon society. "The iron hand of war," says Mitchell, "shakes off from men the trammels of habitual thought that binds down the greater part of the species to everyday mediocrity; it throws them back, and roughly too, upon their own innate qualities, which are brought rapidly to light and maturity. That, along with the good, many bad qualities are also brought to light, cannot, indeed, be denied; but the school which leads to perfection, has yet to be discovered."—Life of Wallenstein, pp. 262, 263.

other colonies of the New World, because its original state is less known, because our collections respecting it are copious, because in our opinion it possesses an interest superior to the rest, and because we are anxious to do what no Englishman has yet done,—to give a strictly impartial account of the circumstances attending its subjugation. Spain, in reference both to Peru and to all her colonies, has guilt enough to expiate: let her no longer bear the stigma of that with which historic justice refuses to brand her.

The origin of the Peruvians, like that of all the American people, is wrapt in darkness impenetrable to historical criticism. Assuredly, however, they were not, as Robertson would have us believe, of the same stock as the other people of that continent. “The striking similitude,” for which he contends, “in the form of their bodies and the qualities of their minds,” exists only in his imagination. The Patagonian bears no affinity to the Cherokee; the Peruvian has not the slightest resemblance to the Mexican. The physical differences between the two former will sufficiently demonstrate a diversity of origin; the difference alike in language, reigion, and manners, attests a distinction no less characteristic between the latter. Not one word in one hundred in the speech of these people has the slightest affinity. This one fact, which we give on the authority of a learned Peruvian, who has devoted much time to Mexican antiquities, at once overthrows the hypothesis of the celebrated Scotchman. Nor do we subscribe to his opinion, that America was peopled from the north-eastern regions of Asia only. On the contrary, we think that both Peruvians and Mexicans derived their origin from central or southern Asia. The enquiries of recent missionaries in the South Sea islands, especially of Mr. Williams, have brought to our knowledge a multitude of new words to enrich the stores of the etymologist. Now in the dialects of one race occupying the southern islands of Polynesia, there are many, very many words, substantially the same as the Peruvian. Of this fact, which, so far as we know, has not hitherto been noticed, any reader may convince himself by comparing Mr. Williams’s vocabularies with such portions of the gospels as have yet been translated into the language of Peru. Nor would it, we think, be difficult, by the aid of language alone, to trace the gradual migration eastwards of two distinct races,—one from Java, the other from Japan. Here tradition confirms the fact deducible from analogy of language. Many of the islanders, with whom Mr. Williams and other missionaries conversed, asserted that at a period beyond the reach of their rude computation, their ancestors had arrived from the west; and some there were who distinctly remembered a tradition that in former times a colony of their race had sailed to a great

country in the east.* Whether one of these races reached the coast of Mexico, is a problem which we shall not attempt to solve; but that the other did found an empire on the coast of Peru, is to be inferred from the facts we have stated. After all, however, these facts are not so decisive as we could wish. Peru, like Mexico, evidently consisted of two distinct people—the labouring and the dominant castes; the original inhabitants and the victors. Certainly the Peruvians had two distinct languages, though the one still extant among their descendants predominated. And if Garcilasso de la Vega, himself a Peruvian, and of the imperial race of the incas, is to be believed, there was a *third*,—that spoken by the incas themselves, and wholly unknown to the rest of the nation.

But, whatever may have been the origin of the Peruvians,—whether they came direct from the Asiatic continent, or through the medium of the numerous islands which lie scattered in the Pacific ocean,—a more interesting subject is that furnished by their condition prior to their subjugation by the Spaniards. Here tradition indeed is our only guide; yet it is entitled to respect when it is preserved by a people tenacious of their ancient customs, when it does not ascend to a high antiquity, and when it is corroborated by reason. Tradition, in fact, is the only authority we possess for the early history of most other countries,—of Greece, Rome, Scotland, and Ireland, amongst the rest,—and we know not by what canon of criticism it can be received in the one case, and rejected in the other. If ever this mode of conveying facts to posterity deserved our notice, it is in regard to the empire of the incas. To us,—and to every enquirer the result will be the same—it brings all the conviction attending written documents.

The state of Peru prior to the Spanish invasion must be divided into two periods,—the one preceding, the other following, the establishment of an imperial government by the incas.

1. If Garcilasso de la Vega, in his *Commentarios Reales*, is at much pains to vindicate the nation from the heavy charges brought against it by the Spaniards, in reference to the latter period, he does not conceal one of its vices during the former. In this case he has been suspected of too much severity, in order to heighten the contrast between the two conditions of Peruvian society. The suspicion, however, seems to be unjust; for the most hideous features of his picture were to be discovered among the neighbouring tribes long after the arrival of Pizarro; and are still to be recognized among the savages on the banks of great

* In confirmation of these views, we beg to refer to Dr. Lang's *Work on the Polynesian Nation*.

rivers in the interior of South America. Garcilasso commences with the *religion* of the old Peruvians. Their gods were numerous enough; there were many not only to each village, hamlet, district, but to each family and hut; they presided over mountains, rocks, lakes, streams, plants, and stones. Many of their natural objects were adored; the emerald was adored; so were the lion, the tiger, the bear, and, indeed, every animated being that was to be dreaded. We may, however, doubt whether the *degree* of adoration rose so high as Garcilasso believed. He says, "If by any chance the people met a beast of prey, they did not flee from it; no, they knelt down on the ground to adore it, and allowed themselves to be killed and eaten, without the least effort to defend themselves." Here was devotion in perfection! They adored one bird for its size, another for its diminutiveness; this beast for its strength, that for its agility; this snake because it was twenty-five feet long, that because its bite was deadly. The condor and the eagle had another claim to veneration; they were held to be the progenitors of many tribes scattered throughout what was afterwards called the empire of Peru. "In short," says our native guide, "there was no animal, however low or vile, that these men did not worship." Again: "Some worshipped the earth, which they called *mother*, because it supplied their wants; others the atmosphere, because by it we breathe and live; some the fire, because it heated them." In the same manner, maize and vegetables of all kinds were adored, because of their utility. The fishes of the sea were adored by the inhabitants of the coast, for allowing themselves to be taken; and the sea itself, which they called *Mama-cocha*, or, *Our mother*, was held in extraordinary veneration.

The sacrifices of these people were more horrible than their religious notions: not occasionally, but very generally, they consisted of human victims. Captives taken in war were invariably offered to propitiate the deities; and when these could not be had in sufficient abundance, or, when the case was too urgent to admit of delay, men, women, and children, were selected from the tribe, and put to death. "The manner was this: while alive, their bodies were opened; the heart and lungs extracted; the blood, before it had time to cool, was made to besmear the idol; the palpitating members were then inspected by the augurs, to learn whether the sacrifice was acceptable or not: in either case, the heart and lungs were burnt in honour of the god; and then all present devoured the rest of the body with exceeding relish, and no less rejoicing,—even the father who feasted on his own son." In regard to the great bulk of captives, these sacrifices were not practised. It was not always that the will of the gods was required to be known, nor always that either

priests or people had leisure for long sacrifices. But the captive was no less an article of human food. If ignoble, he was merely cut into quarters, and divided among the victors; if a chief, he was tied to a pole, his flesh was cut from his bones in small pieces by women and children, no less than men, and eaten before his eyes. "What a sight!" says Garcilasso,—“a man to see himself eaten,—to see his flesh by piece-meal go down the throats of the bystanders!” “Incredible!” the indignant reader may exclaim. We beseech you, however, to suspend your ejaculations, and to read on,—for there is something yet to come more monstrous still.

From religion's cruel sacrifices, the good inca passes to the habitations, the government, the food of the ancients. The first were generally close together, for the sake of common defence amidst the wars which perpetually armed tribe against tribe, and hamlet against hamlet: but they had no squares, no streets, no method of constructing places of security. Some families lived on the summit of rocks, some in the valley, many in the recesses of forests, many in caves of the mountains, many under ground. Where every district was at war with its neighbour, any place less than usually accessible, was sure to be chosen. There was no hereditary chief; he who had the greatest courage was tacitly obeyed as the leader. Whether all these petty chiefs,—these *regecillos* as Garcilasso calls them,—had the degree of authority which he assigns them, may, perhaps, be doubted; but it is reasonable enough to infer, that whatever portion they had, they abused it. Tyrants are more frequent in savage than in civilized life; and where they have no curb, either of law or of opinion, they may riot at pleasure.—But the *food* of these Indians is the subject most shocking to European ears. Hear a Peruvian writer: “In many provinces, the inhabitants were exceedingly fond of human flesh, and so gluttonous, that, before the Indian whom they were killing, had time to die, they sucked his blood through the wound which they had given him: and this they did when they cut him in pieces,—catching every drop, and licking their very hands, lest any of the precious fluid should be lost. They had public shambles for the sale of human flesh.” “To such a degree was this fondness for human flesh carried, that they did not spare such of their own children as they had by women not of their own tribe,—by women whom they had captured in war. They did more; they gave to many of the male captives, not only life, but wives of their own nation, (the conquering nation) and the children issuing from such connections they reared as their own, until somewhat grown and plump, when they ate them. They had even colleges of boys and girls thus reared to be eaten: never did they spare the victims, either

through the relationship between them, or through fostership,—ties that produce affection even in animals of different races.” Nor did they always confine themselves to children whose mothers were of another tribe: sometimes they boiled or roasted those which they had by native women; and often they consumed their parents in the same manner.*

Though this horrible custom is not asserted of all the tribes, and was, perhaps, intended to be understood of the more savage only, still scepticism may naturally be felt as to its existence in *any* district or *any* tribe. Yet the evidence of tradition, so carefully adduced by Garcilasso, is triumphantly confirmed by writers, whose veracity cannot be disputed. If excesses nearly as horrible prevailed in the neighbouring regions, centuries after they had been banished by the incas from the soil of Peru,—if they existed in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries; nay, if they exist at this very day—we may fairly conclude that they *once* prevailed in Peru; and, consequently, that our author neither invents nor exaggerates. Out of the numerous authorities, however, which might be adduced, in confirmation of his statements, we shall select two only,—both contained in the list of works at the head of this article.

From 1547 to 1555, Hans Staden of Homberg, in the principality of Hesse, was attracted, like so many other Germans, to the unknown regions washed by the river Amazon. He had the misfortune to remain a captive in the hands of an Indian tribe; and the manner in which he escaped the fate of other captives is, if entire faith is to be reposed in his relation, explicable only by that Providence which suffers not a sparrow to fall unnoticed to the ground. But whether, in this respect, his relation be entitled to implicit credit, or not, no doubt can be entertained of his intimate acquaintance with the savages in the interior of Brazil. His descriptions are too minute, too graphic, to be the work of invention. When any prisoners, he observes, arrive at a village, they are first beaten by the women and children: they are next covered with grey feathers, their eye-brows are shaven, and a dance is formed around them. Then they are

* “En muchas provincias fueron amicissimos de carne humana; y tan golosos, que antes que acabase de morir el Indio que matavan, le bebian la sangre por la herida que le avian dado; y lo mismo hacian quando lo iban desquartizando, que chupavan la sangre y se lamian los manos, porque no perdiese gota della. Tuvieron carnicerias publicas de carne humana.” “Crescio tanto esta passion, que llego a no perdonar los hijos propios avidos en mugeres estrangeras,—de los que cantivavan y prendien en las guerras. Hacian mas,—que a muchas Indias de los que cantivavan les reservavan la vida, y les davan mugeres de su nacion,—quiere decir de la nacion de los vencedores; y los hijos que avian los criavan como a los suyos, y viendolos ya crecidos, se los comian,” &c.—*Com. Real.*

bound, so as to be unable to escape, and, in this condition, are delivered to some females who become their temporary mistresses ; should there be any offspring—a very frequent result—it is reared ; and when the fit takes them, they kill and eat it. They feed all their prisoners well. At the end of a certain time, they prepare for the feast of the massacre : they make a liquor for drink. When all is ready, they appoint the day, invite the inhabitants of the neighbouring villages to the feast, and fill the drinking vessels. Two or three times before the arrival of the fatal day, the prisoner is brought forth, and dances of joy are formed around him. The day before the drinking commences, which is always two days before the execution, a cord is tied round his neck—the club with which he is to be killed is carefully painted, and the process is accompanied by singing. The club being thus consecrated—for in most of the ceremonies there is evidently a religious meaning—it is suspended in the interior of a hut, and the singing is continued during the whole night. The next day is passed in drinking, and the prisoner is made to enjoy himself like the rest. Towards night-fall, another hut is erected in the centre of the place, and there the victim sleeps. Before day-break, the dancing round the club recommences ; when the sun rises, the prisoner is brought forward—the hut destroyed—the open space cleared of the rubbish—the mysterious cord taken from his neck and tied round his body, and a heap of stones is placed near him. These he may use against the women who are waiting for his limbs. A large fire is then lighted within two yards of the victim ; the club, adorned with feathers, is brought by a woman, who bids him look at it : a man then takes it, and displays it before him. The intended executioner is then greased and painted,—probably to enable him to escape in case he should be closely pressed by the victim. Receiving the club from the hands of an Indian, he approaches the prisoner, saying, “ Here am I ready to kill thee ! thy people have killed and have eaten many of mine ! ” The other generally replies, “ My death will be revenged ! ” In a moment the executioner aims a deadly blow at the head of the victim, which seldom fails to scatter the brains on every side. The body is then seized by the women, who drag it to the fire, and scrape the skin so as to whiten it. The arms and legs are then amputated, and each of the members is carried by a woman in triumph round the huts. The body is then opened, and the horrid repast commences,—a repast described with such sickening accuracy by some writers, as to be intolerable in the recital.

The same circumstances are no less minutely recorded by Pero

Magalhanes de Gandabo, whose history of Brazil has obtained so much praise from Camoens, Pinelo, and Nicholas Antonio. We need not therefore repeat them; we shall only add, that the woman given to the victim was generally one of the youngest and fairest in the village; that the union between them generally continued a year; that sometimes, inspired by affection for her partner, she escaped with him into the woods.

These horrible customs, as we have already intimated, are related by the missionaries from Spain and Portugal, during the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries. If *their* authority should be disputed by some readers—for religious prejudice will go any lengths—perhaps that of living Protestant travellers will be received. The book of Lieutenant Smyth, published about a year ago, and relating to his own experience in the centre of South America, confirms, in the fullest manner, the account we have extracted from Spanish and German writers.

In all, then, that Garcilasso has said respecting the cannibalism of Peru before the domination of the incas, he is abundantly justified by inference. Probably he is no less so in some of his other statements; but scarcely so in all. It may be true enough, that in some tribes at least, a man might marry his near relatives; but we cannot believe that he was, in any place, allowed to marry his own mother. The sister or the niece, the aunt or the daughter-in-law, he might, and probably did marry; for we have instances enough of such connexions among savage nations. But the other connexion is so repulsive to nature, that we do not believe it ever existed in the wildest state of society. Another assertion, however, of this writer, may have a better foundation,—that in some tribes girls were valued, not according to their chastity, but to their notorious want of it. The indifference with which maidens were bestowed upon captives doomed to be eaten, is evidence enough of the little estimation in which chastity is held by savages. Indeed, it never was valued by them. The excesses of our sailors in the South Sea islands may be adduced as equally illustrative of this truth. Upon the whole, then, we may conclude, that the state of society in Peru, prior to the domination of the incas, was not much, if any better, than their descendant has represented it. To this subject we have paid the more attention, because a shallow philosophy has asserted that the natural state is, in most countries, and supereminently in Peru, the state of innocence and virtue.

II. The instruments by which these regions were reclaimed from the most savage barbarism to comparative civilization, can never be known. The tradition of the country—a tradition rife in the days of Garcilasso—is curious enough. The Sun, the great

deity of the world, seeing the dark ferocity of the people, had pity on them, and sent two of his children, a son and a daughter, to instruct, to reclaim, to govern them. The directions which he gave them for their conduct, have also been preserved. From the banks of the lake Titicaca—a lake which posterity regarded as sacred—he commanded them to pass through the country, and wherever they should find a large ingot of gold growing out of the earth, that place was to be chosen as the seat of their future empire. They were to rule in reason, justice, piety, benignity; to regard their subjects as children; to imitate their father, the Sun, who spreads his cheerful beams on the evil no less than the good, and who is the support of universal nature; to be in all things the benefactors of mankind. From the borders of the lake, the brother and sister, now husband and wife, proceeded northwards, until they reached the site of ancient Cuzco. There they struck the earth, and on the first blow being given, appeared the ingot of gold: there they established their seat. From thence the one travelled northward, the other southward, calling on the people to forsake their solitary haunts, to live in common, to subject themselves to the wise laws framed by the world's great deity, to forsake ferocity for mercy, darkness for light, misery for happiness. The appearance of these divine messengers, their countenances, their looks, their persuasive dignity, had great effect on the people, who hastened to the heaven-appointed spot, built houses, cultivated the ground in the neighbourhood, and thus called the imperial city of Cuzco into existence. While the monarch, Manco Capac, the first inca, taught the men the arts best suiting their strength and character, his sister and queen, Mama Oello Huaco, instructed the women in such as were domestic, especially in the manufacture of cotton and woollen garments. By the successors of Manco Capac, the empire was progressively extended, until it embraced a vast territory,—until brutal ignorance and ferocity were replaced by civilization and humanity.

This, being the tradition of the incas themselves, is entitled to some respect. Who these strangers were who thus laid the foundation of society in the New World, cannot, we repeat, be discovered. Conjecture, however, may amuse itself in the attempt. Did they come from Asia? The answer must, we think, be in the affirmative. There is considerable affinity between this tradition and the corresponding ones in the Old World. The Chaldeans boasted that their civilization, their learning, the origin of their society, were the work of a personage equally mysterious,—of one too, who came from a lake in Arabia. The Tartars, or at least one important nation of the race, had a

similar tradition; and the Chinese themselves assert that their first dynasty sprung from the embrace of a god with an illustrious female of their nation, on the banks of a lake. The sun, too, was the great divinity, not only of the Massagetæ, but of all the people of northern and central Asia. We all know the reverence in which it was held by the Persians. The Celts, whose cradle must be sought in the vast plains north of the Caucasus and the Caspian, brought the worship into Europe. The Goths, too, practised it; so did the Egyptians; so did the Phœnicians; so did three-fourths of the ancient world, whose origin was immediately derived from Asia.

When we consider that the tradition relative to the civilization of Peru was not an ancient one—that Manco Capac could not have flourished more than four hundred years prior to the Spanish invasion, since twelve sovereigns only had swayed the destinies of the country when Pizarro arrived, we may the more readily adopt it. It must, however, be regarded as the tradition of the dominant caste—of the family which civilized the kingdom, rather than that of the Peruvian nation. The latter people had one of their own, which appears also to have been received by some of the neighbouring tribes. According to them there was once a deluge—great, but not universal. When the waters had subsided, a powerful individual appeared,—whether mortal or immortal is not very clear,—and divided the whole earth (that is the South American Continent) between four great kings, each having a separate point of the compass. Among them was Manco Capac, the first inca, the founder of Cuzco and the Peruvian empire, whose actions, according to this relation, do not materially differ from those ascribed to him by the incas themselves. A third tradition, substantially the same, is perhaps of much higher antiquity. It speaks not of a deluge; but it tells us that at the beginning of the world, four men and four women, brothers and sisters, issued from the rocky caverns of the mountains in the vicinity of Cuzco, and spreading themselves to the east, west, north, and south, gave origin to all the tribes of the New World. The oldest of the brothers was Manco Capac; of the sisters Mama Oello; and to their superior dignity was assigned the richest and most extensive portion of the Continent.

Whatever might be the origin of the civilizers of Peru, they are entitled to the gratitude of posterity. Manco Capac, the first inca, was assiduous in the establishment of colonies in districts which war had rendered desert, in the encouragement of population, and in the diffusion of wise laws. He is said to have founded about forty pueblos, or communities (if such a term can

be applied to rural populations), all within a few leagues of Cuzco, the capital. Some of his laws may seem rigid, especially when we call to mind the past habits of the people. Adultery, homicide, open robbery, were visited with the last penalty. No man was to marry under twenty; because, prior to that age, he was unfit to discharge the duties of husband, father, agriculturist, and citizen. All people were to marry within the degrees of kindred, lest their race should be confounded. The flocks which wandered in the forests, were tamed, and became common property. Over each pueblo, or rural population, a chief was placed by the inca,—one noted for superior wisdom, and still more for superior humanity. All the males laboured together, and for the common weal; the produce of their labours being brought into one heap, and each man being allowed to take from it a portion commensurate with the wants of his family. That these regulations were excellently adapted to inspire with the love of society, men who had hitherto lived apart, who had dreaded their fellows, whose arm had been raised against one another, is evident. But the inca perceived that they were not enough. He knew that human laws alone, however good, however firmly executed, would not ensure social happiness: they might restrain from the grosser vices, but they could not touch the heart; they might influence the conduct, but they could not purify that which is the basis of all conduct,—inward principle. Hence the introduction of religion. The great object of adoration was the sun, which was regarded as the creator of all things. Whether this luminary was worshipped prior to the establishment of the monarchy, has been matter of conjecture. When, however, we consider, that legislators, both civil and religious, do not so much *create* as *direct* popular opinions; and that some great tribes of Southern America did actually adore that glorious luminary; we shall possibly be correct in supporting the affirmative of the proposition. If, as has been before related, almost every object in nature was converted by the early inhabitants into a divinity, the sun could not well escape the honour. But, from the time of Manco Capac, it was to be the supreme deity;—the one great preserver, no less than creator of the universe. Doubtless, that legislator and his sister-queen had been reared in this faith; and this affords a presumption that they, or their immediate ancestors, had not long departed from Asia. But it is equally clear, that they added much to the tenets which they had been taught to hold. Seeing the extreme barbarity of the people, and their amazing docility, the inca did not hesitate to proclaim himself and his sister as the Children of the Sun,—as the legitimate offspring of the deity,—as divinely commissioned to reform and

enlighten the world,—as entitled to unconditional obedience,—as themselves divine and worthy of adoration, though in an inferior degree. All the directions which he gave his new subjects, were, he affirmed, not his, but his great father's: if they were followed, happiness would be the result; a happiness that would continue to increase, until it should be pure and unmixed: if they were neglected, the divine favour would be withheld, and the nation would be replunged into the misery from which it was so painfully emerging.

Finding, by agreeable experience, the truth of his assurances, the people referred to his father the blessings they enjoyed: he had effected a moral revolution, so utterly unexpected, so very stupendous, that no doubt was entertained either of his divine mission, or of his divine character. Nothing, indeed, could equal the reverence with which he was beheld, alike by his contemporaries and descendants. Disobedience to his commands was held to be, not the violation of any human law, but resistance to the authority of God, and, therefore, meriting the severest punishment. Hence, when he ordered a temple of the sun to be erected in every rural population, with priests and vestal virgins to serve in them, he was promptly obeyed.

But if the nature of Manco Capac were thus divine, the assertion must be understood of his soul, not of his body. Like ordinary mortals, he grew old; and, like them, he felt the approach of death. If, however, he would preserve the ascendancy which he had acquired; if he would have the sceptre to remain in the hands of his descendants, he must not die exactly like the rest of mankind. He assembled his children and his chief vassals in his palace of Cuzco, assured them that he was summoned by his father the Sun, to leave this world, and enjoy eternal rest in that above: and the same words, we may observe, were repeated by every subsequent inca at the close of life. But before he revisited his celestial home, he would leave to his beloved children, and chief vassals, his natural councillors, an additional proof of his regard. All of them, and their male descendants after them, were to assume the awful title of *inca*, lord or ruler: since he loved even his chiefs as his own sons; what better proof of his benevolence than to call them by his own title? But the reader must be on his guard against confounding the various persons included under this denomination. The first who bore it was Manco Capac; and it was considered as peculiar to him, as the title of emperor to some other potentates. In the second place, it was applied to his sons, and their descendants,—to all males of the imperial family, whose blood on *both* sides was pure. These were the *natural* incas.

The third class, consisting of members not of the imperial family, were incas *by privilege*. The use of the word being thus indefinite, some epithet was necessary to designate the individual. Hence, the reigning monarch was styled *Capa* Inca, the only lord, the sovereign; and the princes of the imperial family had each some word associated with the generic one, explicit enough for the purpose. Yet the simple title of inca was one so honourable, that the few chiefs of the third class on whom it was conferred, and who had the privilege of transmitting it to their descendants, were enraptured with it. It placed them, so far as mere temporal dignity was concerned, nearly on a level with the offspring of the sun. "Our emperor," exclaimed they, "has not only changed us from wild beasts into men; not only has he taught us regulations for the social, and laws for the moral life; not only has he brought us into immediate connexion with our creator the Sun, and given us a participation in his temporal authority; to crown all, he has invested us, to a certain extent, with the awful attributes of majesty." In gratitude for such favours, there was no honourable epithet which they were willing to withhold from him. He was styled *Capac*, the rich, the magnanimous;—not rich in worldly substance, for all tradition affirms that he had none; but rich in the qualities of the mind and of the heart. Other words represent him as the friend, the benefactor, the father of the poor. On his bed of death, he is said to have left some good instructions to his legitimate, his bastard (for he had concubines enough), and his adopted sons. He told them that their first duty was to reduce the neighbouring tribes to their laws and religion; but the mischiefs which this ambitious command might have produced, were greatly diminished by the positive injunction, that their conquests must be effected by reasoning rather than by the sword. They were, in all things, to imitate their father the Sun, who shines with equal splendour on the good and the bad. They were to be the most diligent observers of the divine laws, and to take especial care that their deeds corresponded with their professions. "What Indian," observed the dying inca, "will believe you to be children of the Sun, if you say one thing and do another?" But these latter instructions rather applied to the offspring of Manco Capac, whom, after dismissing the chiefs, or incas of the third order, he retained in his apartment. And he is said to have inculcated the obligation of each imperial heir marrying a sister, in preference to any other female, that the purity of the divine blood might be the more rigorously maintained: if a prince had no sister, legitimate or illegitimate, then he was to marry his niece, or his first-cousin. This regulation, which was, as we all know,

general in ancient Egypt, was artfully devised; it could not fail to inspire the multitude with great reverence for the divine family. As in Egypt, too, it was partly founded on religious duty. If Isis and Osiris, brother and sister, were man and wife, so, in the Peruvian mythology, were the Sun, and his sister the Moon. But the Indians did not hold a female deity in much reverence: she had no powers other than those which she had received from the male god; nor do we know that a single temple, a single altar, was erected in her honour: it is doubtful, whether even a single prayer was addressed to her. In the same spirit, if the pallas, or princesses of the imperial family, married out of their lineage, the offspring did not participate in any of the privileges enjoyed by the children of the incas, or princes.

If the Peruvian tradition which fixes the reign of the first inca about four hundred years before the invasion of the Spaniards, be correct (and it cannot be very erroneous, when coupled with the other fact, that twelve monarchs were embraced by the same period), the reign of Manco Capac must be referred to the former half of the twelfth century. His death was long deplored. Divine honours were paid to him: animals and fruits were offered in sacrifice to him. Amongst these animals there might, for anything we know, be human victims. Garcilasso, indeed, has no allusion to such a holocaust; but, for obvious reasons, this writer is anxious to represent his ancestors in the most favourable light to Christian Europe. We know that, on subsequent apotheoses of the kind, human victims were not wanting;* though we *think*, that they were offered on no other occasion, and that the whole nation was singularly averse to the shedding of blood.

Manco Capac was succeeded by the inca Sinchi Roca, his issue by his sister-queen, Mama Oello, or Mama Cora, as she is styled by some writers; that is, by Our Mother the Queen. The meaning of the word *Roca* is unknown,—it is not to be found in the general language of Peru; and probably, as Garcilasso observes, it belonged to the peculiar language of the incas, the use of which is for ever lost. *Sinchi*, we are told, means *valiant*; but if so, it must, in the present case, have been applied rather to the mental than to the bodily character of this inca, who warred with no people. Yet he considerably extended the bounds of the new state, which, when he ascended the throne, did not stretch on any side farther than about eight leagues from the centre, Cuzco; but which, on his death, extended twenty-eight

* This is denied by Robertson, whose acquaintance with the early writers on Peru is exceedingly limited. It is affirmed by Xeres and others.

leagues,—at least in one direction. None of the savage tribes in these regions were, we are gravely assured, subjugated by the sword: no—reason and example, blessed by the Sun, were sufficient to reclaim them from their brutish state, and to incorporate them with the celestial monarchy! In vain should we attempt to fix the duration of his reign, or that of his father. Tradition on this point is not uniform; but that which estimates the latter at thirty-eight, the former at about thirty years, may be near to the truth. Like his father, he had many concubines, by whom he left a numerous issue; but the eldest of his sons, by his sister and queen, Mama Cora, could alone succeed him.

The third sovereign was Lloque Yupanqui, the Left-handed Reckoner. The former word sufficiently denotes the defect which the carelessness of his governors allowed him to contract; the latter alludes to his many great qualities, which included all that could be *reckoned* or enumerated respecting him. He did more to extend his territory than either of his predecessors. Reason and example might be very good weapons with *some* men,—but he knew that *others* required harsher treatment; and he sallied out from Cuzco, on his mission of civilization, with about 6000 well-armed followers. The result justified the innovation. The inhabitants of Cana, indeed, whom he first induced to forsake their beastly customs, to adore the Sun, and acknowledge him as the son of that deity, readily obeyed, declaring that the laws and customs which he introduced were far better than their own. Not so the Ayaviri, who refused to forsake their ancient gods, or to hold the slightest intercourse with him. A war ensued, which, from the extreme forbearance of the inca, was at first disastrous; but in the end, he allowed the sword to do its work, and the enemy was compelled to submit. Though he had thus reduced them, he would not punish them: all that he required from them was, that they would become his subjects on the same conditions as the rest,—obey the same god—observe the same laws—and adopt the same customs. From the scene of this new conquest, he dispatched his messengers to summon another people to obey the divine will. These were the Collas, who boasted of their descent from the Lake Titicaca, which they held as the chief of their gods. They offered no resistance, and in this respect they were imitated by most other tribes in the vicinity. So successful was this inca in his conquests and proselyting, that, towards the north, he incorporated about forty leagues with his kingdom, to the east, about twenty. For these exploits, no less than for his love of justice, and his care of the poor, he was held in greater reverence than any of his contemporaries. On his death,—or, we should rather say, on his obeying the summons of his father,

by returning to his native heaven,—he was adored as one of the tutelary gods of Peru.

Mayta Capac, the fourth inca, persevered in the same course, and with the same success. When a nation refused to obey his summons, he caused it to be reduced; when it voluntarily submitted, he regarded it with peculiar favour. It is, however, to be observed, that, as the incas extended their conquests, they became more severe in chastising the refractory; and so far, consequently, they lost sight of the noble injunction bequeathed to them by the founder,—that, like their father the Sun, who shone equally on the good and the bad, they should be merciful to the very worst of mankind. To repair the desolation which he had introduced into some of the conquered districts, he colonized them by his faithful subjects from the vicinity of Cuzco. He built several towns, or, we should rather say, villages, and was the first Peruvian monarch that had science enough to throw a bridge over a river. Being more of a hero, that is, killer of men, than his predecessors, he was more successful than they in extending the bounds of his empire.

Of his son, nephew, and successor, the fifth inca, Capac Yupanqui, we have only to say, that he proceeded in the same course, and conferred equal benefits on the people. Westwards he carried his victorious arms to the ocean, and forced the savage tribes along the coast to acknowledge his authority. Some of them, we are told, were addicted to extremely abominable crimes, and by his orders were burnt alive. On his death, the Peruvian territory extended from Cuzco,—to the north, one hundred and eighty leagues; to the south, forty; to the west, sixty; to the east, thirteen. Hence we may infer, that, in this last direction, he made no progress, owing, probably, to the greater hostility of the people, and still more, to the natural difficulties of the country.—With equal brevity must we dismiss the next inca, Roca, the sixth monarch of the race, who differed little from his ancestors. He published a law that the children of the poor should not be permitted to frequent school, lest they should become proud, and refuse to discharge their menial duties. Of these schools we have a very imperfect idea: this is the first time we read of them; and we are not informed what was taught in them. Probably a knowledge of the laws, and of solar worship, was inculcated; and it is equally probable that some tincture of the military arts was communicated to the young nobles of Peru. We read, too, of astrology; and poetry was certainly not unknown. This monarch was something of a philosopher. “If I were obliged to worship any thing here below,” he was wont to say, “it should be the man of wisdom.” There seems to be

reason to doubt whether he held the Sun in as much veneration as most of his predecessors. He had some faint notion of a power still higher, which was called Pachacamac, the Soul of the Universe. What was this deity? Some of the Spanish writers tell us that it was a demon; but from better authority we learn that it was accounted a beneficent principle; that, by the *thinking* portion of the natives, it was held to be the Creator and Preserver of all things. The very name, we are told, was esteemed too holy to be pronounced. Certainly no temple, no statue, was erected in honour of this divinity, nor was one single prayer addressed to it. It was to be worshipped—if worshipped at all—in silent reverence.

The seventh monarch of Peru had a name regarded as ominous, Yahuar Huacac,—or the Weeper of Blood. It arose, we are told, from the fact of his one day, while a mere infant, emitting from his eyes blood instead of tears. In the estimation of the people, something dreadful impended over the offspring of the Sun; and after his assumption of the reins of empire, the public anxiety became greater. That he himself was not without his apprehensions, is evident, from his entrusting the command of his armies to experienced generals, while he was occupied in peaceful objects,—in the construction of large buildings, and the administration of the laws. But fate was not to be resisted. The eldest son and heir of the inca evinced from childhood a disposition that caused much affliction to all around him. He beat his comrades, tormented his servants, and behaved insolently or cruelly to every body. In vain did his father try to reclaim him, by placing before his eyes the opposite conduct of his predecessors; by shewing him that, in kindness of heart, and affability of manners, they had always excelled their very subjects. Nothing could move him. Despairing of his reformation, the inca resolved to deprive him of the succession, in favour of another son. He was expelled from the royal palace, and obliged to associate in the labour of some shepherds, who guarded the flocks consecrated to the Sun. He was now in his nineteenth year, and the loss of his birthright gave him no little affliction. How regain it? He resorted to a stratagem likely to influence the superstitious people with whom he had to deal. After an exile of three years, he one day appeared in his father's palace, and requested an audience, under the plea that he was the bearer of an important message. The inca, in great anger, sent him word that, if he did not instantly return to his solitude, he should be put to death,—the doom always inflicted on men who, even in the slightest matters, presumed to disobey the awful son of the sun. The prince, however, ventured to reply, that he had not

been actuated by disobedience; that he was merely the messenger of a power great as his father's; that he had been compelled to come; and that, if the inca still refused to see him, he would return and acquaint the potentate with the ill-success of his mission. Hearing these words, the inca was astonished. "Had he on the wide earth an equal? Who was he? Where was he?" The prince was admitted, allowed to prostrate himself, and deliver his errand. "Thou only, great sovereign, must know, that this very day, while reclining under one of the rocks which abound in the pastures of Chita, and while, in obedience to thy command, tending the flocks of our father the Sun (whether asleep or awake I cannot tell), there suddenly appeared before me a strange man, whose face and costume were very different from those of our day. His beard was a palm in length; his robe was ample and loose, and reached to his feet; and he led by the hand an unknown animal. He said to me: 'Kinsman, I am a son of the Sun, brother of the inca Manco Capac, and of his sister-wife Mama Oello Huaca, the founders of your dynasty; consequently, I am kinsman to you all. My name is Viracocha, and I come by the express command of our father the Sun, to bid thee repair to the inca my brother, and tell him that the greater part of the province Chinchasuyu, subject to his authority, and other parts which have never acknowledged him, are now in arms against him; that they are collecting a vast army, and will soon be on their march to Cuzco, to dethrone him, and destroy that imperial city. Wherefore see my brother the inca, and put him on his guard in this strait.'" Yahuar Huacac would not believe the story, and bid the prince instantly return to Chita, or his life should be the sacrifice of his temerity. But the members of the imperial family who happened to be present, advised the sovereign not to neglect the warning: it might come from the Sun—at all events, there could be no harm in preparing for the worst. The inca, however, was obstinate. But in about three months afterwards, a vague rumour was spread that an army of rebels, thirty thousand strong, was on its way to Cuzco. In great terror, and deeming himself unable to collect any force capable of resistance, he left the city, and betook himself to the mountains. The frightened citizens called on the exiled prince, who was known by the name of the fantom, Viracocha, to defend them. He obeyed the call; but in the first place, he hastened to his father, whom he reproached with abandoning the holy city, and on whom he still urged the duty of resistance. Finding his remonstrances vain, he went to Cuzco, accompanied by four thousand of the royal troops. To these he joined such of the citizens and of the rural population as were able to bear arms. But his

chief aid was in a friendly tribe, which sent its thousands to oppose the rebels. In the battle which ensued, he was completely victorious. Here was an end of the rebellion, and we may add, of the father's reign. Viracocha would allow of no ruler but himself; he alone would inhabit the imperial palace at Cuzco; and the dethroned inca was made to pass the rest of his days in a rural fortress.

That Viracocha, knowing the aversion of his father to him, actually fomented the rebellion of which we have spoken, is evident. He thus obtained the renown of a prophet, no less than that of a conqueror. If we except this undutiful act, and the hypocrisy which accompanied it, we have little to condemn in his conduct. He was an active, a valiant, an enlightened monarch; and what is more to his credit, he laid aside his cruelty, his unbecoming insolence. He is said to have uttered the remarkable prophecy,—that a day would come, in which the religion and the offspring of the Sun, would be destroyed by a strange and distant people. Like many other prophecies, this, no doubt, was made after the event: we mention it, because it confirms the opinion entertained of this monarch by his descendants. On his death, divine honours were paid to him, and sacrifices were offered to him during a whole year. These sacrifices, unhappily, were not merely of beasts and birds. The most beloved of the inca's women, the most favoured of his servants, were buried with him, that they might administer to his pleasures or his wants in the next world. Sometimes the victims, as Garcilasso confesses, were numerous; but then he assures us, that they were all voluntary,—an opinion contradicted alike by reason and by fact.

Pachacutec, the eighth inca, added many tribes to his empire. Like his immediate predecessors too, he built temples and fortresses, multiplied and enlarged his villages, and was successful in crushing the rebellion of the barbarous people who had been compelled to obey the children of the Sun. And he introduced many new laws, in respect both to crimes and morals. From his sayings, a few of which have been preserved, we may infer, that he was one of the greatest and wisest of his race.—We select five.

“Envy is a cancer which consumes the entrails of him who receives it.”

“He who envies, and is at the same time envied, is doubly wretched.”

“Adulterers are robbers of the worst kind, since they deprive families of peace: hence they must suffer death.”

“The noble-minded man is best known by his fortitude in adversity.”

“The judge who receives presents is a robber worthy of death.”

Yupanqui, the eldest of the three or four hundred sons left by the late inca, succeeded to the throne, and considerably augmented his dominions, especially on the Chilian frontier. He too is highly praised for his love of justice. The next successor,—the eleventh from the great Manco Capac,—was Tupac Yupanqui, who proceeded in the career of conquest. The most important of his acquisitions was Quito, a kingdom about seventy leagues in length and thirty in breadth. But it was slowly obtained, though forty thousand Peruvians followed the standard of their monarch. During the hostilities, which occupied nine years, he sent for his heir, Huayna Capac, that the young prince might acquire experience in the military art; and so well did the latter acquit himself, that he was soon left with the sole conduct of the war,—the inca returning to Cuzco. Three years more sufficed for its conquest; but we may doubt whether it ever would have been conquered, had not its valiant monarch died, without male issue to succeed him. The generals of Quito immediately submitted, and assisted him in the conquest of some neighbouring tribes, the names of which had hitherto remained unknown to the Peruvians. Full of glory, Huayna Capac returned to Cuzco, where he was received with unusual honours. Before his departure, he had married according to custom, his eldest sister: he now married the second, simply because he had no son by the eldest. No prince could be heir to the throne of the Incas, whose father and mother were not equally the children of a monarch, and consequently brother and sister. But the sterility of the first queen was painful to the imperial family and the people: it was a novel event; and some kind of apprehension began to be felt, lest the second sister should also be barren, and the divine race of the Sun become extinct. To avert this evil, as Huayna had not a third sister, it was resolved, that he should be allowed also to marry his first cousin, the daughter of his uncle, and that both should be considered as legitimate wives, and their offspring as eligible to the throne, as if they were the issue of the eldest sister. This innovation, as we shall soon perceive, led to a greater.—Tupac Yupanqui lived to a good old age. That he had a mind superior to most of his people, is evinced by his doubts as to the divinity of the Sun. In short he was a philosophic sceptic,—a rare merit in one of his age and country. “It is said,” he one day observed, “that the Sun is a living deity, and that he is the

creator of all things ; yet when any thing is created, surely the creator must see the work of his own hands. But many things are made which the Sun does *not* see, and therefore he is not the creator of *all* things." This was one of his illustrations ; but he had another equally characteristic of a thinking barbarian : " That the Sun is not a living being, may be inferred from this, that he *never tires*. If it were animated with life as we are, like us it would experience fatigue." Take a third : " If the Sun were a free-agent, he would visit other parts, were it from curiosity merely, and not run eternally in the same line."

Huayna Capac, the twelfth inca, was the most powerful and the most celebrated of his race. Lord of regions so extensive, of a numerous army, and of faithful vassals, he aimed at a magnificence of which none of his ancestors had ever dreamed. And by his subjects, he was certainly regarded with superior veneration. Even Garcilasso allows that he was, during his life, —from the very commencement of his reign,—worshipped as a god. Wherever he appeared, the ground was strewn with flowers, triumphal arches were erected, and hymns chaunted to greet the present deity. But he had not so high an opinion of himself, or even of his country's god, the Sun. Like his father, he was sceptical enough. During a great festival, held in honour of that luminary, while the assembled priests and augurs stood around him, and thousands of other eyes were fixed upon him, he was observed to look attentively at the Sun. This profane act, which was absolutely prohibited by the laws, scandalized all present. " Inca," said the high-priest, who was one of his uncles, " knowest thou not, that thou art doing that which is forbidden ?" The monarch looked downwards for a moment, but only to lift them with greater boldness towards the luminary. " Sire, our sovereign lord ?" rejoined the priest, " to look at our Father the Sun is prohibited as a great impiety ; and by so doing, thou givest a bad example to all who are assembled for the worship of the Supreme." Turning round to the royal priest, the monarch observed ; " I will ask thee two questions : I am your emperor, and universal lord ; would any one among you be so rash, as to bid me rise from my seat, and undertake a long journey ?" " Who that ever lived," replied the other, " would be so mad ?" " And is there one among the chiefs of my kingdom, however rich and powerful he may be, who would disobey me if I commanded him to set out for Chili without a moment's delay ?"—" The man lives not," replied the priest, " who would hesitate to sacrifice his life, if thou shouldst command him !"—" Then I tell thee," rejoined the inca, " that our Father the Sun must have a master,—one greater and more powerful than he,—a

master who bids him perform his daily task, without resting. If he were truly the Supreme Lord of nature, he would one day or other rest, if it were only for his mere pleasure." This barbarian was a better reasoner than his father.

In his public administration, and his military exploits, Huayna Capac was not unlike his predecessors. Like them he made new laws, added new districts to his empire, and reduced such tribes as rebelled. Of the nations conquered by him, the Mantas, next to the people of Quito, were the most considerable. They lived on the sea-coast, adored the ocean as their common mother, but acknowledged many other gods, as lions, tigers, snakes, &c. One of their chief divinities was a great emerald, which on public days was adored by multitudes, and to which sacrifices were offered. The crafty old cacique of the place, contended that the offerings most agreeable to this god were smaller emeralds, which were its children. The people, with all their religion, were guilty of extremely abominable crimes; and so we may observe, were many of the American tribes. If tradition were entitled to any weight, there were once giants in the region south of Chili. This, we suppose, has given rise to the fable of the Patagonian giants, which fills a place in the relations of even modern voyagers. For their abominable practices, says Garcilasso, they were destroyed by fire from heaven; and their huge bones, whitened by that element, may still be found in that region. Hence the *Terra del Fuego*, or country of fire,—a more satisfactory explanation of the name than those usually given.

But if Huayna Capac was a great warrior, he was a poor statesman. He had ventured, soon after the conquest of Quito, to marry the daughter of the deceased monarch, whom the great bulk of the nation recognized as heiress to the throne. Perhaps to this alliance, more than to the success of his arms, was owing the submission of that extensive region. The marriage, however, could not be held valid by the Peruvians: the princess of Quito was regarded as merely the concubine of their inca; and the issue could not have any claim to the throne. All the youths who derived their being from the inca,—if their mothers were of the humblest grade of society—were indeed revered as participating in the divine blood of Manco Capac; but all were not equally respected. If, as was generally the case, the concubine was of the imperial family, her son was held in far greater estimation than if she were a stranger; and for the obvious reason, that by both his parents he was descended from the heavenly source. Princes who had this double claim, were venerated as more than men; as at least a kind of demigods. Where the mother was the legitimate wife and sister of the

monarch, the feeling approached to adoration. The offspring of the inca's marriage with the heiress of Quito, was regarded only as a mortal prince. That offspring, Atahualpa, was doomed to a painful immortality in the annals of Peru. He was, however, the best beloved of Huayna's children, and the capital of Quito was more agreeable to him than his hereditary Cuzco. For this youth the inca would gladly have removed from the succession Huascar, his son by the second of his sisters, and consequently the heir to the throne. But such was the force of public opinion, so awful was the reverence in which the pure race of the Sun was held by the whole empire, that all-powerful as he was—god on earth as he was reputed to be—he dared not openly violate the established law of succession. He resolved, however, to invest his favourite son with Quito, over which, as his own conquest, his rights were, he thought, omnipotent. Yet he would not take this step without the consent of his legitimate heir, and of the imperial family. He summoned them to his palace at Quito, and in their presence opened the important subject. From the foundation of the state, he observed, it had been the invariable custom to incorporate every new conquest with the original territory of Manco Capac, and to regard the whole as integral and inalienable. Huascar, therefore, by a fundamental law of the monarchy, was the heir of Quito no less than of Peru. But he frankly acknowledged his affection for Atahualpa, and entreated the consent of Huascar to the cession of Quito. Such was the respect with which the wishes of the inca were received, that the prince readily agreed to his father's prayer, and Atahualpa was immediately invested with the lieutenantcy of Quito, and recognized as the successor of his father. In Quito, Huayna Capac spent the remainder of his life; the government of Peru being entrusted to Huascar. Perceiving his end approach, he called his sons and his chiefs around his dying bed, and confided to their care the interests of his beloved son. They were to obey him as their lawful inca, within the boundaries of Quito, which he had amplified in his behalf. He commanded that his body should be opened; that his heart and bowels should be buried at Quito, while the rest of his corpse should be taken to Cuzco, and laid with the ashes of his ancestors.

Some time after the usual sacrifices were offered to the memory of the deceased inca, the empire began to be agitated by the ambition of the two brothers. Huascar was taught to believe that it could not be dismembered even by the command of an inca; that *he* was the only legitimate king of Quito; and that his most urgent duty was to reclaim at least the superiority over that kingdom.

But he perceived how necessary it was to proceed with caution in an affair which might lead to a ruinous civil war. His first step was to send a prince of his family to Atahualpa, who should expose the injurious policy of the late monarch in dismembering the empire, but who should at the same time say that he would recognize his brother as king of Quito on two conditions. The first was, that the kingdom should not be aggrandized by new conquests; and that whatever territories might be subjugated by the unaided arms of Atahualpa, should be incorporated with the government of Cuzco. The second was, that this prince should do homage for Quito itself, and acknowledge himself to be merely the regal lieutenant of Huascar. Atahualpa saw the danger which menaced him; but as he excelled in dissimulation, he replied with the profoundest submission, that in his heart he had always owned the superiority of his brother; that he willingly avowed himself a vassal of Huascar; that if the sovereign of Cuzco wished it, he would even resign the lieutenancy of the kingdom, and retire into private life. The answer pleased Huascar so much, that he recognized his brother as king of Quito; and only required, that within a given time the latter should repair to Cuzco, and do homage in person for that important fief. In this letter the inca was perfectly sincere: indeed, as he had carried his point, he could be no other than satisfied. But it was in a very different spirit that Atahualpa promised to obey that command, as well as every other command that the inca, his sovereign lord, should be pleased to dictate. One request, however, that he might be allowed to celebrate, at Cuzco, the funeral rites of their father, with such a retinue as became so great an occasion, might surely have opened the eyes of the inca. But Huascar, who believed his brother to be as sincere as himself, readily agreed to it. Atahualpa, who had long resolved to dethrone the inca, commanded his subjects to accompany him to Cuzco, for the ostensible purpose of doing homage. But he ordered his generals to see that under the garb of peace, each soldier should conceal the weapons of war. With a veteran army, thirty thousand strong, he proceeded from Quito, and advanced towards Cuzco. But the provincial governors of Huascar, through whose jurisdiction Atahualpa, passed, were alarmed at the appearance of so vast and so well disciplined a host, which they suspected was intended for something more than mere show, and which certainly was ten times greater than was required for the ostensible occasion. This suspicion they communicated to the inca, who was more alarmed than they. He summoned all who depended on him to join him with their forces without delay. As many as were in the vicinity obeyed; but

the warning was too short for a successful resistance. The troops of the monarch of Quito—he himself remained near the frontier, more perhaps from cowardice than from any other cause—now advanced with greater celerity. A battle ensued, in which Huascar was vanquished and made prisoner. Intelligence of this great victory being sent to Atahualpa, he summoned all the members of the imperial family to appear at Cuzco, under the pretext that he wished their advice in respect to the restoration of Huascar. All, except the infirm and the aged, obeyed. It was now that the real character of Atahualpa was displayed. The kindred and chiefs of the imperial prisoner being assembled on a plain near Cuzco, Huascar was brought from his prison, and with fetters, in deep mourning, was made to appear before them. The sight, so unexpected, so affecting, of their captive monarch, was too much to be borne. They adored him as he was led through their ranks, and they proved that their attachment to him was a thousand times stronger than it had ever been in the days of his prosperity. But little time was given them for sorrow : they were soon put to death, in presence of their afflicted master, by orders of Atahualpa.

Not satisfied with this cruelty, the victor assembled the *coyas* and *pallas*, that is, the imperial princesses, and put them to death also, with circumstances of cruelty so great as to be incredible, were they not attested by eye-witnesses. His vengeance next fell on all who had shewn any zeal for Huascar ; and, at length, it descended to the very domestics of that monarch. No monster ever surpassed Atahualpa in cruelty ; and he was the more to be dreaded, from the profound dissimulation with which he covered his designs. His antipathy against the imperial family is easily explained. So long as any prince remained whose parents were *both* connected with the blood of the incas, *he*, who had derived his existence from a foreign princess, would never be universally acknowledged as Inca Capac, or successor of the great Manco. So long even as any prince, who, on the paternal side only, could boast of the divine blood, was suffered to exist, that prince would be his rival. Hence his determination to destroy all, that he might be the only surviving member of the family. He murdered the females no less than the males ; for might not any one of them happen to have issue ? and if that issue were of the divine family, on the maternal side only, still it would be regarded with some degree of reverence by the people ; while *he* could not fail to be laden with execration by the whole empire. His purpose, however, was not completely successful. Some of the princes and princesses escaped. Among them, was the mother of the writer to whom

we are indebted for many of the preceding facts. She was the niece of Huascar, the daughter of one of his brothers, and, consequently, the grand-daughter of the great Huayna Capac.

It was during the hostilities between the two brothers, that the Spaniards, under Pizarro, invaded the country, subverted the empire, and destroyed the religion, of the incas. Before, however, we proceed to this the third part of our subject, we shall make a few additional observations on Peruvian society.

The religion of the incas is the subject most likely to arrest the reader's attention. Garcilasso assures us that the Sun was the only object of adoration. To the great bulk alike of priests and nation, that luminary appeared as the supreme god; but we have already alluded to a greater,—Pachacamac, the mysterious soul of the world, whose superiority was recognized by the few, but to whom no temples were raised, no prayers addressed. And it is certain that other deities were acknowledged. The stars, for instance, were regarded as the children of the Sun and the Moon; and, like their mother, they were held in veneration, though we have no positive information that they were adored. Yet the homage paid to them must have been great. Even the living inca was adored; so was the heir to the throne: and his brothers were received by the people in a manner bordering on adoration. And, at a later period, we have the testimony of eye-witnesses, to prove that temples were erected in honour of other deities than those we have enumerated. Of this fact, an illustration shall be given in the next division of our subject.

That temples of great extent were erected in honour of the sun, is well known. Where there are temples, there must be priests. They were first instituted by Manco Capac; but his successors improved his rude outline of worship into a complete system. The priests of the great temple at Cuzco, were always incas of the imperial family: the head of them was generally brother or uncle of the reigning monarch. The priests of the numerous provincial temples were also incas, but not of the divine race; they were those made by privilege,—those whom Manco Capac created. The sacrifices which they offered, consisted of agricultural produce, of beasts, birds, and other animals. Garcilasso is very angry when told that human victims were sometimes offered; yet there seems to be no reason for doubt on the subject. We *know* that they were immolated on the death of the reigning monarch; and that the reason assigned for the cruelty was, the necessity of his being attended, in the other world, in a manner suitable to his dignity. With this fact before us, we may well be inclined to admit the assertion of several writers, that, on *other* occasions of extraordinary importance,

similar holocausts were provided. They were offered to the Sun alone—at least, in ancient times. The moon being the wife; the stars, thunder, and lightning, being the children of that luminary, were also represented in the temple, which had separate apartments for them. All animals sacrificed were opened, and their entrails inspected by the augurs, who predicted from appearances very similar to those which influenced the pagans of Greece and Rome. The entrails were then burnt on the altar, the fire being previously derived from the sun by means of a brazen lens, which concentrated the solar rays, and set fire to some cotton placed in the focus. The rest of the body was eaten by the assembled people; nor was drinking forgotten. The inca, seated on his throne near the altar, invited his great chiefs, one by one, to pledge him; and each thus honoured, advanced, and reverently took the cup from his hand; while the monarch held another, which he put to his lips, but which he seldom tasted. The princes of his family, at command, then went to the incas by privilege, and said, “The emperor invites thee to drink with him!” The man approached the throne, and received the cup from the right or left hand of the monarch, according to his dignity. The custom was the same with the hereditary caciques, and the governors nominated by the sovereign. But in regard to the inferior vassals, there was a different custom. They were not allowed to approach the majestic host; the messenger,—generally one of their own grade,—bore two cups, and having repeated the formula, “The emperor invites thee to drink with him!” drank from one, and the guest drank from the other. The person thus honoured did homage three times by kissing the air, a homage rendered to the Deity just the same as to the inca.

The Peruvian religion had its virgins, no less than its priests; all consecrated to the Sun, and doomed to a life of chastity in the vicinity of the temple, but in houses inaccessible to the priesthood as to every other male. They were chosen for their beauty or birth, generally before they had attained eight years. All were, on one side at least, connected by blood with the imperial family, and all born in wedlock. These ladies, exiled from the world into the remote cloisters of the House of the Sun, could be visited only by the queen and her daughters, or such other ladies as received the previous consent of the inca. They were, however, not very solitary, if it be true that, besides a host of other domestics,—all females,—they were waited on by five hundred noble damsels. The administration of the house rested with the old recluses, who were called Mamacunas, or matrons. The occupations of these pagan nuns were spinning, weaving,

and making garments for the Sun, which, as he of course was unable to wear them, were given to his children the incas. They prepared, too, the consecrated bread and drink for sacrifices. To them no access could be gained. There was a tremendous law against the recluse who violated her vow, and her accomplice: *she* was buried alive; *he* was hung over her grave: but would the death of two only satisfy the sun for the infidelity of his *wife*? The parents, relations, friends, servants, of the guilty, were to be executed; their houses razed to the ground; the very place which they had polluted by their presence, to be left desolate! This punishment was so terrible, that we may be sure it was seldom inflicted: Garcilasso says, *never*; but then he is equally sure that the crime was never committed.

There were other recluses besides those consecrated to the sun. Many houses were devoted to the maintenance of virgins who were to become the wives or concubines of the sovereign. To preserve their purity, they were taken from their parents at a very early age, and educated in these houses until they were called to ascend the bed of their lord. They were watched with the same jealous care as the virgins of the sun. The noblest maidens in the land, and, still more, their kindred, thought themselves honoured by the choice. When once they had entered the walls of the inca's palace, they could not return to the house of virgins. Nor could they marry after the inca's death. Death, in its most horrible shape, would have been the penalty of such a step. It was called adultery, and adultery against the awful majesty of the sun. The crime, however, could not well be committed, as these ladies were closely guarded in the palace after the inca's death, and occupied in domestic duties.

The Peruvians acknowledged the immortality of the soul, and the resurrection of the body. The soul they held to be distinct from matter; and the human body they called by the expressive name of animated clay. In the world after this, they admitted rewards for the good, and punishment for the bad. The universe they divided into three worlds. There was the *hanan pacha*, or lofty world,—the heavens, destined for the residence of the virtuous. There was the *hurin pacha*, or world of generation,—the world in which we mortals live. There was the *ucu pacha*, or world below, situated in the centre of the earth, and frequently called by another name, signifying the devil's house,—this was reserved for the wicked. But the region of spirits was not a spiritual—it was a corporeal world, like the present one. In the upper world, the region of the blessed, happiness was believed to consist in tranquillity of mind, in exemption from all labour and care, from all sickness and pain. In the lower, chastisement was

thought to consist in trouble of mind, anxiety, labour, sickness, sorrow, and in "all the ills which flesh is heir to." But the resurrection formed the most curious part of the Peruvian creed. The body and soul must rise; but not to enjoy either happiness or misery in the world above or the world below. No; they must rise for this world only—to follow the same course of existence as they followed when on earth. For this reason the natives were loth to disturb the bones of the dead. They were to remain in the same place, and in the natural position, that when the soul revisited them, it might have no trouble in finding the different members. When a Peruvian lost a hair, a nail, or a tooth, he concealed it with much care, that when he returned to earth he might know where to find it. Whether the good were to rise no less than the evil; whether, if the evil only revisited the earth, they were to have another chance of becoming virtuous, and consequently happy in the world above; whether the duration of the second life in this world were to be longer or shorter than at present, are facts which Peruvian theology does not explain. Nor is it possible to say whence they derived their notion of a resurrection, so different from that of other people. Nor do we know what precise ideas they attached to the notion of the soul. We know only that it was held to be very different from the body. In the opinion of all it could not sleep, like the bodily house which it inhabited. Dreams were only the experience of the soul separate from the body, which was every night deserted by its ethereal tenant.

For the *political* institutions of the Peruvians we must refer the reader to Robertson, whose rapid summary, though by no means accurate, is sufficiently so for general reference. But if it were more inaccurate than it is, our contracted limits would not permit us to correct or expand it. For the same reason, we must pass over many of the *social* customs, which, however interesting, could be developed only in a book especially devoted to the subject. We may, however, observe that the Peruvians had a species of knighthood; that noble and royal youths were armed after rigorous fasting, and more rigorous exercises; that these exercises consisted in running, wrestling, fighting, &c.; that the exhortation to a life of virtue, justice, and mercy, was given by the inca himself, who at the same time delivered to the novices the chief symbol of the state. Other princes of the imperial family delivered the rest in succession.

The *science* of the Peruvians has been much overrated. In military exercises, indeed, they excelled all the people of the South American continent; so they probably did in medicine; so they certainly did in computation of time; and in some other

branches of knowledge, as arithmetic, geometry, and music, they were undeniably superior to the rest. Still their intellectual stores were meagre; they kept no register of events; they were ignorant of the art of writing; they had no traditional order of bards or historians, to transmit great deeds to posterity. They could melt all species of metals; and from the fluid ore they could fashion such instruments, whether domestic or warlike, as they required; but these were exceedingly rude. In music they made some progress; and they indulged in poetry, though not so passionately as the European people. One or two specimens may be seen in Garcilasso, but they have little merit. The reader who is curious to see what the Peruvian mind was capable of effecting, may look into Robertson.

III. But to most readers, the relation of the conquest of Peru by a handful of Spaniards, may form the most attractive division of the present article. In it we shall not follow guides who wrote nearly a century after the event: our chief authority shall be an eye-witness, Francisco Xeres, the secretary of Pizarro, whose *Relacion* was published at Salamanca in 1547,* while most of the great actors in the scene were still living. If Xeres be accused of something like partiality in the cause of the victor, it should be remembered, that, at the very time the book appeared, Pizarro was in no great favour with the government of Spain.

It was in November 1524, that Pizarro, accompanied by only one hundred and twelve men, left Panama in quest of some rich country to the south-east. His first expedition, as every body knows, was fruitless. Another, in the following year, disclosed to the adventurers the existence of a richer country (Quito) than any they had yet seen on the shores of the Pacific. In 1526, the Peruvian coast was first unfolded to the view of Europeans; but where could the force be collected sufficient to justify its invasion? The visit of Pizarro to Spain in 1528, procured him the empty title of Adelantado, or governor-in-chief of the country he had discovered; but not a soldier, not a dollar, to aid him in subjecting it to the authority of the emperor. It was not before 1531 that he had collected in Panama about one hundred and eighty soldiers, who boldly set out for the conquest of an empire which had frequently sent 50,000 men into the field! Subsequently, indeed, he received a slight reinforcement; but at no time prior to the fall of Atahualpa did his followers number two hundred and fifty! The Island of Santiago was taken without difficulty; a descent was made on the continent; Tumbez was destroyed; and a for-

* It had, however, we are told, been published at Seville some years before. We have only seen the edition of Barcia, "*Historiadores Primitivos*."

tress built, or rather strengthened, near the mouth of the Piura, which was honoured by the name of St. Matthew. Here Pizarro resolved for a time to watch the course of events. He was perfectly well acquainted with the civil war then raging between Huascar and Atahualpa, and on this circumstance, no doubt, he founded his hopes of success. The caciques in the neighbourhood, he summoned, characteristically enough, to acknowledge Don Carlos, the august emperor, as their only liege superior, and, at the same time, commanded all to become faithful sons of our holy mother the Church! The latter mandate was not understood,—the former was disputed; and hostilities commenced, which ended in success to the invaders. Here he learned that Atahualpa was encamped in the valley of Caxamalca, about fifteen days' march from St. Matthew. With the boldness for which he was conspicuous among a nation of bold men, he resolved to go in search of the inca, whom, if he could get into his power, he would treat as Cortes had recently treated Montezuma, the sovereign of Mexico.

It was on the 24th of September, 1532, that Pizarro departed on this perilous enterprise. His force amounted to sixty-seven horsemen, and one hundred and ten foot soldiers, and of these, nine returned to St. Miguel in about four days. Some of the caciques, however, received him favourably. They were devoted to Huascar, and were consequently the mortal enemies of Atahualpa, who had just overrun their country, and committed cruelties worthy of his cause. But to the envoys of the latter inca, he held a very different language: he was the *ally*, the *friend* of Atahualpa, and was hastening to Caxamalca to give the most convincing proofs of his attachment. Both were equally hypocritical; both professing the strongest wish for peace, while they were meditating each other's destruction. To his companions, Pizarro made no secret of his resolution to dethrone the inca, and to annex Peru to the other possessions of Spain. On his passage, if the following extract be true, he found a more striking proof of Peruvian idolatry than we have elsewhere seen:

"They (the inhabitants between Caxamalca and San Miguel) have disgusting sacrifices, and idol-temples, which they hold in great veneration. Here they offer their most valuable effects. *Every month* they immolate their own children, and with the blood of the victims paint the faces of the idols, and the doors of the temples. These edifices they convert into tombs, and fill them with corpses from the floor to the roof. They often sacrifice themselves, laughing, dancing, and singing, at the very moment they strike the fatal blow: often, too, they drink largely, and then request some one to cut off their heads."

Either Xeres must be mistaken as to the frequency of these

oblations, or Garcilasso, with most of the early Spanish writers on Peru, must have represented the religion of the incas in colours much too favourable. We are disposed to conclude that such offerings took place on the death of the sovereign, of some inferior inca, and perhaps of the hereditary cacique of the place where the temple stood. Though, according to the native writer we have so often quoted, they were allowed, on the death of the inca Capac only, there is reason to infer that they were much more frequent. Every prince of the reigning family was believed to participate in the same divine nature, and to be entitled to make his appearance in the other world in a manner superior to other men. And the rural caciques, whose power was equal to that of these princes, and who were often connected by marriage with the race of the Sun, would not be slow to imitate the example,—to demand human victims at their own apotheoses. This is the only rational way of accounting for the frequency of human sacrifices, unless, indeed, we suppose that there were in the empire many districts which preserved their ancient idolatry, and which the reforms of the incas could not reach.

Wherever Pizarro advanced, he heard of Atahualpa's cruelties—of whole communities, thousands in number, being put to the sword for no other crime than that of suspected attachment to the cause of Huascar. It was on the 15th day of November, 1532, that Pizarro reached Caxamalca, from which the army of Atahualpa was distant about a league. Why the inca had made no effort to oppose the march of the Spaniards, is not very clear. Perhaps he expected to find in the Christian chief, what he had been taught to expect, a friend and ally; perhaps he despised the handful of men who thus presumed to penetrate into the heart of the country. In the square of the city, Pizarro found a fortress of considerable strength. This he made stronger still, and then invited the inca to come and see him. The messenger whom he first dispatched on this occasion, soon reached the quarters of Atahualpa:—

“ The tyrant was at the door of his tent, seated on a high seat: a great number of Indians, men and women, were about him, all standing, and nearly surrounding him. On his head was a woollen cap, which might have been taken for silk, about two hands high, and tied by little cords which descended to his eyes: this made him look more grave than he really was. He held his eyes fixed on the ground immovable. When the captain was in presence of the monarch, he intimated, by an interpreter, that he was an officer of the governor, who had sent him on this visit, and to express the great desire which the governor had to see him; that the latter would be exceedingly glad if the inca would see him at Caxamalca. Many other things were spoken by the messenger; but

Atahualpa would not deign to lift his eyes, or to reply, though a cacique spoke for him."

At length, however, the dignity of the inca so far gave way, that he spoke, and even smiled. He had, he said, an enemy in a powerful cacique: would Pizarro put all the Spaniards in march to fight the rebel? "What need of *all* the Spaniards for so trivial a service?" was the reply. "Ten of the number will be fully equal to it." Here the inca could not avoid smiling, doubtless at what he considered a vain boast. However, he treated the envoys well, and promised to visit the Spanish governor the following day. And well he might; for thirty thousand men were supposed to be encamped round him. Early the next morning, a messenger arrived at the fortress from Atahualpa, saying, "My sovereign informs thee that he means to visit thee, but he will come with his armed men, as thy men came to his camp yesterday!" "Let him come as he pleases," was the reply: "I will receive him as a brother and friend!" Shortly afterwards a second messenger arrived, to say that the inca would not bring his armed men, but a simple retinue only, unarmed, to wait on him, and that he wished to lodge in the house of the Serpent. It was, however, soon perceived that this was all a feint: the plain between the city and the camp was immediately covered with the soldiers of Atahualpa, drawn up in columns. The situation of the strangers was a critical one. Their chief ordered every man to be under arms, and all the horses to be saddled and bridled. The pieces of cannon were pointed towards the plain, ready to be discharged at a moment's notice. The greater part of the Spaniards were then put in ambush along the streets leading out of the square; twenty men only remained with Pizarro in the fortress, and their charge was to seize Atahualpa, if treachery should be designed. Not a soldier in or out of the fortress was to move until a signal was given. The discharge of the artillery would shew that mischief was designed: then the men in the fortress were to mount their horses; those in the streets were to join them; and all were to rush on the enemy, while the ordnance did its part. The rest must be told in the words of Xeres:—

"The governor, perceiving that it was near sun-set, that Atahualpa did not advance, and that he was continually joined by more troops, desired him, by a Spanish messenger, to enter the place before night-fall. When this messenger was in presence of the inca, he saluted him, and motioned that he should go towards the governor. The prince acceding, began to march with his soldiers. Those of the advanced guard had weapons concealed under their garments, which were a kind of stout shirts; they had also slings and stones, which shewed their bad intentions.

The momentt he advanced guard entered the place, a troop of Indians, clad in a sort of livery similar to the squares on a chess-board, marched first to prepare the way. They were followed by three other bands, clad differently, who sang and danced ; then came a number of men covered with armour, wearing crowns of gold and silver. In the midst of these was Atahualpa, in a litter adorned with parrots'-feathers of all colours, and with plates of silver and gold. He was borne by a great number of Indians, and was followed by four other litters, filled by persons of distinction. Lastly, came a multitude of other people in columns, wearing crowns of silver and gold. No sooner were the leading corps entered into the place, than they removed a little to make room for those who followed. When Atahualpa arrived among them, he ordered all to halt, his litter and the other litters still remaining elevated. Soldiers continued to arrive, and one of the chiefs in the advanced guard was seen to approach the fortress where the artillery was concealed, and thrice to raise his lance, as if intended for a signal. When the governor perceived it, he asked friar Vincent de Valverde if he would go and speak to Atahualpa by means of an interpreter. The latter consented, and advanced, holding in one hand a crucifix, in the other a Bible. Passing into the ranks of the Indians, he reached the emperor, and said,—‘ I am a priest of God ! I teach Christians the things of God ; and I come to teach you also. I teach that which God himself has communicated, and which is written in this book. In this capacity I beseech thee, on the part of God and of the Christians, to become their friend : Heaven wishes this, and if thou obeyest, it shall be well for thee. Go and speak with the governor, who is waiting to receive thee !’ Atahualpa desired to see the book, and it was presented to him shut. As he could not open it, the monk held out his hand to shew him how it should be held, when the inca gave him a slap on the arm, in great disdain, and then trying to open it, he succeeded. He was not, like the other Indians, astonished either at the letters or the paper ; and he threw it five or six yards away from him. He replied haughtily to the monk’s discourse,—‘ Well do I know the excesses you have committed on your route, how you have killed my caciques, and pillaged houses.’ The friar replied,—‘ The Christians have not so acted : some Indians, indeed, without the governor’s knowledge, brought certain articles, but he returned them.’ ‘ Well,’ rejoined Atahualpa, ‘ I shall not stir from this place until you have restored every thing !’ He then stood up in his litter, and exhorted his people to be ready ; while the friar returning to the governor, related what had passed, and how Atahualpa had thrown the Holy Scriptures on the ground. In a moment Pizarro put on his cuirass, took his sword and shield, and followed by the twenty Spaniards whom he had retained near him, passed through the crowd, and courageously came up to the litter of Atahualpa,—four only of his men being able to penetrate so far. Without the least fear, however, he seized the inca’s left arm, crying ‘ Santiago !’ Instantly the artillery was discharged, the trumpets were sounded, while horse and foot left their places of retreat. No sooner did the Indians perceive the horses advance at full gallop, than they left the square, and fled with so much precipitation, that they forced the palisades which defended the

city, and many tumbled over one another. The horsemen rode over them, killing and slaying them, and the fugitives were pursued. Those who remained in the square were charged with such fury, that, in a short time, most were put to the edge of the sword. During all this time, the governor held Atahualpa by the left arm, unable to pull him from his litter, which was too high for his reach. To bring it to the ground, the Spaniards slew many who carried it; and if the governor had not protected the inca, he would that day have been punished for all his cruelties. In defending him, Pizarro was slightly wounded in the hand.

“During the whole time of this action, no Indian used his arms against the Spaniards,—so great was their dread at the sight of Pizarro, of the horses at full gallop, and at hearing the thunder of the cannon. These were new things to them, and they tried to flee rather than to fight.”

That this was a dreadful day—one for ever disgraceful to the arms of Spain—nobody will deny. But was it so wholly unprovoked as the historian of America would have us believe? That the reader may, without trouble, compare the relation of *an eye-witness*, with that which Robertson derived from writers *long subsequent to the event*, we give the latter in a note.* Among these subsequent writers,—subsequent by nearly

* “Early in the morning the Peruvian camp was all in motion. But as Atahualpa was solicitous to appear with the greatest splendour and magnificence in his first interview with the strangers, the preparations for this were so tedious, that the day was far advanced before he began his march. Even then, lest the order of the procession should be deranged, he moved so slowly, that the Spaniards became impatient, and apprehensive that some suspicion of their intention might be the cause of this delay. In order to remove this, Pizarro despatched one of his officers with fresh assurances of his friendly disposition. At length the inca approached. First of all appeared four hundred men, in an uniform dress, as harbingers to clear the way before him. He himself, sitting on a throne or couch adorned with plumes of various colours, and almost covered with plates of gold and silver enriched with precious stones, was carried on the shoulders of his principal attendants. Behind him came some chief officers of his court, carried in the same manner. Several bands of singers and dancers accompanied this cavalcade; and the whole plain was covered with troops, amounting to more than 30,000 men.

“As the inca drew near the Spanish quarters, Father Vincent Valverde, chaplain to the expedition, advanced with a crucifix in one hand, and a breviary in the other, and in a long discourse explained to him the doctrine of the creation, the fall of Adam, the incarnation, the sufferings and resurrection of Jesus Christ, the appointment of St. Peter as God’s vicegerent on earth, the transmission of his apostolic power by succession to the popes, the donation made to the King of Castile by Pope Alexander of all the regions of the New World. In consequence of all this, he required Atahualpa to embrace the Christian faith, to acknowledge the supreme jurisdiction of the pope, and to submit to the King of Castile as his lawful sovereign; promising, if he complied instantly with this requisition, that the Castilian monarch would protect his dominions, and permit him to continue in the exercise of his royal authority; but if he should impiously refuse to obey this summons, he denounced war against him in his master’s name, and threatened him with the most dreadful effects of his vengeance.

“This strange harangue, unfolding deep mysteries, and alluding to unknown facts, of which no power of eloquence could have conveyed at once a distinct idea to an American, was so tamely translated by an unskilful interpreter, little acquainted

a century—was Calancha, whom the celebrated Scotchman almost exclusively followed in this part of his work.

There is nothing in all history to be compared with this day's transaction. Thirty thousand men dispersed by less than two hundred, a great monarch made prisoner, a great empire subverted, without the loss of one single life on the part of the assailants ! This one fact makes us doubt, notwithstanding the positive assertion of Xeres, whether *any* of the Peruvians were armed ; if they were, assuredly they were the greatest cowards the world has yet seen.

The behaviour of Pizarro to the dethroned inca was in the highest degree brutal. His dissimulation, which was equalled only by his courage, was not always proof against the native ferocity of his character. As gold was the principal object, both of himself and his followers, the inca was assured of freedom,

with the idiom of the Spanish tongue, and incapable of expressing himself with propriety in the language of the inca, that its general tenour was altogether incomprehensible to Atahualpa. Some parts in it, of more obvious meaning, filled him with astonishment and indignation. His reply, however, was temperate. He began with observing, that he was lord of the dominions over which he reigned by hereditary succession ; and added, that he could not conceive how a foreign priest should pretend to dispose of territories which did not belong to him ; that if such a preposterous grant had been made, he, who was the rightful possessor, refused to confirm it ; that he had no inclination to renounce the religious institutions established by his ancestors ; nor would he forsake the service of the Sun, the immortal divinity whom he and his people revered, in order to worship the God of the Spaniards, who was subject to death ; that with respect to other matters contained in his discourse, as he had never heard of them before, and did not now understand their meaning, he desired to know where the priest had learned things so extraordinary. "In this book," answered Valverde, reaching out to him his breviary. The inca opened it eagerly, and turning over the leaves, lifted it up to his ear : "This," says he, "is silent ; it tells me nothing ;" and threw it with disdain to the ground. The enraged monk, running towards his countrymen, cried out, "To arms, Christians ! to arms ! the word of God is insulted ; avenge this profanation on those impious dogs !"

"Pizarro, who, during this long conference, had with difficulty restrained his soldiers, eager to seize the rich spoils of which they had now so near a view, immediately gave the signal of assault. At once the martial music struck up, the cannon and muskets began to fire, the horse sallied out fiercely to the charge, the infantry rushed on sword in hand. The Peruvians, astonished at the suddenness of an attack which they did not expect, and dismayed with the destructive effect of the fire-arms, and the irresistible impression of the cavalry, fled with universal consternation on every side, without attempting either to annoy the enemy, or to defend themselves. Pizarro, at the head of his chosen band, advanced directly towards the inca ; and though his nobles crowded around him with officious zeal, and fell in numbers at his feet, while they vied one with another in sacrificing their own lives, that they might cover the sacred person of their sovereign, the Spaniards soon penetrated to the royal seat ; and Pizarro, seizing the inca by the arm, dragged him to the ground, and carried him as a prisoner to his quarters. The fate of the monarch increased the precipitate flight of his followers. The Spaniards pursued them towards every quarter, and with deliberate and unrelenting barbarity continued to slaughter wretched fugitives, who never once offered to resist. The carnage did not cease until the close of day. Above four thousand Peruvians were killed. Not a single Spaniard fell, nor was one wounded but Pizarro himself, whose hand was slightly hurt by his own soldiers, while struggling eagerly to lay hold on the inca."

whenever a suitable ransom was brought. The riches which had already been found in the camp of Atahualpa and the city, might have satisfied the victors; but he was to furnish, in addition, as much gold as would fill a hall twenty-two feet long, and seventeen feet wide, from the floor half way to the ceiling; and as much silver as would twice fill the room. He was told, that if his messengers produced the quantity within two months, he had no more to fear. They were accordingly dispatched, and their success was prodigious; it was evident, that the amount, though incredibly great, would be collected. The chiefs on every side flocked to see him :

“ Atahualpa was about thirty years of age, of a good look, well made, rather stout, with a handsome but cruel countenance, and with eyes full of blood. He spoke, like a great lord, slowly and gravely, and he reasoned very well. The Spaniards who heard him judged him to be a man of wit. Though cruel, he was jocular; even when he spoke harshly to his subjects, he betrayed his inward disposition to humour.

“ When the caciques of the country round heard of the governor's arrival, and of Atahualpa's captivity, a great number came with the most dutiful sentiments to see the monarch; some had under their jurisdiction as many as thirty thousand souls, all his subjects. On reaching the presence of their sovereign, they respectfully saluted him; they kissed his feet and hands, while he did not so much as even look upon them. His severity, and the absolute obedience of his subjects, were truly surprising. Every day presents were brought to him. Prisoner as he was, he had a monarch's retinue, and seemed cheerful.”

Though it is impossible to doubt that the fate of Atahualpa was deserved, he certainly hastened it by his own conduct. In the first place, he evidently instigated the Peruvians to rise, and to fall on their invaders. Intelligence of men arming on every side daily reached Pizarro. In the second, he ordered his captive brother Huascar to be put to death—an order but too promptly obeyed. This atrocity rendered him no longer an object of sympathy to mankind; he who experienced the iron yoke himself, might surely have been expected to feel for a brother. His days were, however, numbered. Hearing from the Indians that a formidable army was approaching the place, Pizarro brought the captive before a tribunal of Spaniards, who were to try him for treason towards his liege lord the King of Spain! The farce was soon ended; Atahualpa was condemned to be burnt alive: but, in order to arrest this horrible death, he consented to be baptized, and was hung instead of burnt. Eternal the infamy that must attach to the memory of Pizarro and his companions! We can have no pity for Atahualpa—we cannot drop a tear at his fate; but the insolence, the haughtiness, the rapacity of the

invaders, towards, not only him, but the natives generally, must be branded by history until time is no more !

Such is the account which impartial justice records of the fate of this empire. In how much it differs from that given by Robertson, may be seen by comparing the two. To have pointed out the individual discrepancies might have appeared invidious, and would certainly have been wearisome.

In conclusion, we may add that the Spaniards, until their purpose was attained, allowed a prince of the reigning family "to wear the shadow of a crown." But he too was a captive, though nominally at large. The course of rapacity, and of torture to discover concealed treasure, still proceeded, until the ministers of the Church were settled in the country, and until the government of Spain, by successive edicts, vindicated the rights of the natives. The efforts both of Church and state, especially of the former, to protect, to encourage, to elevate, to render happy, the subjects of the incas, have not received their due praise in Europe. If our limits would permit, we should have no difficulty in proving that in thirty years after the death of Atahualpa, Peru began to experience a happiness to which it had been a stranger under the best of its native monarchs. Its condition in everything was amazingly improved; and eventually the Spanish yoke proved, instead of a curse, the greatest blessing that could have befallen the nation.

ART. VIII.—1. *The Athenian Captive.* A Tragedy, by T. N. Talfourd.

2. *Woman's Wit, or Love's Disguises.* By J. S. Knowles.

A noble attempt has been made by Mr. Macready to revive the ancient splendour of the drama, by restoring to us the plays of Shakespeare in all the unsurpassable beauty of the author's original idea; and by substituting for the bustling excitement of the melodrame, the charm of finished correctness and propriety in the dresses, scenery, and other accessories of the piece;—thus raising the theatre to its proper level, as one of the fine arts—or rather an amalgamation of them all; where music and painting occupy their proper stations—heightening, filling up, and throwing a tender lustre over the conceptions of their true inspirer, their aim, and their directress—Poesy;—in which the intricacies of human character and the force of its passions—"its strength to suffer, and its will to serve"—its lighter graces, and its absurdities, shall all be portrayed, and the picture receive

its finishing and life-like touches from the acting of individuals the most susceptible of impressions, and the most formed to convey them of any of their species—for such should an actor be. It was to be expected that such an attempt as this would excite the sympathies of men of genius, and accordingly we have here a tragedy and a genteel comedy, written by the first dramatic authors of the day, and both avowedly with the intention to assist Mr. Macready in his lofty purpose. We wish that we could give them all the praise that their excellent intention and unquestionable talent would seem to demand. But we can do no more than acknowledge their merit; we cannot anticipate their immortality—we cannot rivet them in our memories, or return to them with delight. Where is the creative power, where is any thing approaching to it, which could fill with such thronging, busy phantoms, the

“ Unworthy scaffold—the cock-pit—
The wooden O ”

which Shakespeare had at his command. *Our* authors have all the aids that consummate machinery, science, and taste can give; but there is timidity and restraint in their efforts, and we miss the life and energy that should fill out the design. The defect of both these pieces is a want of power and depth of feeling; our interest is not excited, either by the characters or the story. How this great deficiency in those who profess so much is to be accounted for, whether it is their fault or that of the audiences to whom they address themselves, that unconsciously reacts upon their genius, we cannot say; but whichever it be, it throws a shade of discouragement over the future prospects of the drama. For certainly we cannot expect soon to see equalled, the classic learning—the elegant diction—the high idea of moral beauty which is conspicuous in Talfourd's writing; or the free, rich, descriptive dialogue of Knowles. With such powers at their command—with the mechanism of their art so perfect, what might we not have hoped for? What new realms of life and character—of pathos and sublimity, might we not have expected to see opened to us? and how grievous is it to stop short of them!

We will proceed to give a short analysis of Mr. Talfourd's Tragedy.

The story of *The Athenian Captive* is shortly told. The life of Hyllus, the son of Creon, king of Corinth, is saved by Thoas, an Athenian, during a battle between the nations; this Thoas is afterwards made prisoner, and brought before the old king, who, at the intercession of his son and his twin-sister, Creusa (smitten with love for the captive), consents to spare his life, but on the

condition that he shall become a slave ; he is prepared fiercely to prefer death, when a word from the queen (Ismene, Creon's second wife) changes his resolve, and he becomes a slave. Hyllus and Creusa soothe his mortification ; a second time he saves the prince's life ; but on being required to hand round a libation to be drunk to the downfall of Athens, he bursts into an ecstasy of indignation, and the king, instigated by his wife, condemns him to a cell under the rock—there to await his death ; and banishes Hyllus, who has interceded for him. 'This brings the story nearly to the middle ; and so far, nothing can be more simple, less complicated, or more entirely dependent for its interest upon the working out of the feelings of the different personages. But the conflicting emotions of the prisoner, the love of Creusa, the gratitude of Hyllus, are faintly, and as it were conventionally, pourtrayed. In the second part of the story, the queen takes a more leading part, and there is something in this character that rivets the attention, and is capable, we think of much greater developement than it has received. Thus she tells her story :—

“ I was pluck'd
From the small pressure of an only babe,
And, in my frenzy, sought the hall where Creon
Drain'd the frank goblet ; fell upon my knees ;
Embrac'd his foot-stool with my hungry arms,
And shriek'd aloud for liberty to seek
My infant's ashes, or to hear some news
Of how it perish'd ;—Creon did not deign
To look upon me, but with reckless haste
Dash'd me to earth : Yes ; this disgrace he cast
On the proud daughter of a line which trac'd
Its skiey lineage to the gods, and bore
The impress of its origin,—on me,
A woman, and a mother !”—p. 54.

Creon brought her to Athens, and married her ; but she says,

“ If this slight king,
In the caprice of tyranny, was pleas'd
To deck me out in regal robes, dost think
That in his wayward smiles, or household taunts,
I can forget the wretchedness and shame
He hurl'd upon me once ?”—p. 54.

On the contrary, she has—

“ Not wasted all the shows of power
Which mock'd my grief ; but used them to conceal
The sparks which tyrant littleness had lit,
And sloth had left to smoulder.”—p. 50.

She has urged the Athenian to live, that she may find in him

an avenger ; with this view, she has steeped him in the bitterness of slavery, and procured his condemnation from the ungrateful king :—

“ There is softness in thee,
Weakening thy gallant nature, which may need
The discipline of agony and shame
To master it. Hast thou already learn'd
Enough to steel thee for a generous deed ;
Or shall I wait till thou hast linger'd long
In sorrow's mighty school ? I'm mistress in it,
And know its lessons well.”—p. 47.

She proceeds to tell him,—

“ But who knows,
Who guesses, save the woman that endures,
What 'tis to pine each weary day in forms
All counterfeit ;—each night to seek a couch
Throng'd by the phantoms of revenge, till age
Find her in all things weaken'd, save the wish,
The longing of the spirit, which laughs out
In mockery of the withering frame ! O ! Thoas,
I have endured all this ; I, who am sprung
From the great race of Theseus !”—p. 48.

This exposition of her views and feelings, following up the old king's account of her, and the magnificent description which seems to reveal her nature to us in the early part of the play, form the ground-work of a noble tragic character :—

“ Rarely will she speak,
And calmly, yet her sad and solemn words
Have power to thrill and madden. O ! my girl,
Had not my wayward fancy been enthrall'd
By that Athenian loveliness which shone
From basest vestments, in a form whose grace
Made the cold beauty of Olympus earth's,
And drew me to be traitor to the urn
Which holds thy mother's ashes,—I had spent
My age in sweet renewal of my youth,
With thought of her who gladden'd it, nor know
The vain endeavour to enforce regard
From one whose heart is dead amidst the living.”—p. 7.

“ At stern Minerva's inmost shrine she kneels,
And with an arm as rigid and as pale
As is the giant statue, clasps the foot
That seems as it would spurn her, yet were stay'd
By the firm suppliant's will. She looks attent,
As one who caught some hint of distant sounds,
Yet none from living intercourse of man
Can pierce that marble solitude. Her face

Upraised, is motionless ; yet, while I mark'd it,
 As from its fathomless abode a spring
 Breaks on the bosom of a sullen lake,
 And in an instant grows as still ;—a hue
 Of blackness trembled o'er it ; her large eye
 Kindled with frightful lustre ; but the shade
 Pass'd instant thence ; her face resumed its look
 Of stone, as death-like as the aspect pure
 Of the great face divine to which it answer'd.
 I durst not speak to her."—p. 7.

But when the character should receive its completion, when the long-suppressed passion, the burning thoughts, should find expression, when strenuous action should take place of the stony hardness with which she has been hitherto invested, she falls short of all our anticipations. She hears the story of Thoas, and knows him to be her son ; yet we are not sure that she has recognized him, till, when he has left her, she tells it to Calchas, with a—

“ Wish me joy, old servant ;
 What dost thou think of him who left me now ? ”

She has pointed out to Thoas an escape through the chamber of the king, making him swear to kill the first who shall oppose him. As she anticipated, the king awakes, and is killed by the escaping captive. Considering that this king was at war with his nation,—had twice condemned himself to death,—and that it was even now a question which of the two should die, we cannot think that the feelings of human nature, under the influence of the morality of those times, would have driven Thoas to frenzy, in which state we next find him. But this frenzy is laid aside like a glove,—the maddening crime he unaccountably forgets ; he returns to Corinth at the head of an Athenian army,—conquers it, with a heart “ too light—too jocund—to admit another touch of ecstasy ; ” and does not recal the past, until reminded of it, by the invitation of the queen to hold a conference with her. In this conference she reveals herself to him in her true character, and as his mother ; but he has so completely resumed his remorse, that the feelings of nature are lost, and the mother and son are engaged in a cold and painful dialogue, when they are informed that the Oracle has decreed that the death of Creon shall be avenged,—that the two nations have laid aside their arms, till justice has been done—and that the queen is pointed out as alone able to declare the murderer. In the temple of Jupiter the Avenger, all the parties meet. The queen, solemnly appealed to, rises and confronts Thoas ; but unable to pronounce the fatal word, she points to Hyllus, and falls insensible. Thoas

does not avow himself: coming forward with his mother, he argues with her, and seeks to prevail on *her* to give him permission to save the innocent Hyllus, by criminating himself. But this she refuses, and the discussion weakens and fritters away the interest of the scene; yet there are in it some passages of great beauty:—

“Thou art brave,
As fits a matron of heroic line;
Be great in penitence, and we shall meet
Absolved, where I may join my hand to thine,
And walk in duteous silence by thy side.

ISMENE.

“And couldst thou love me then?”

THOAS.

“Love thee! My mother,
When thou didst speak that word, the gloom of years
Was parted,—and I knew again the face
Which linger’d o’er my infancy,—so pale,
So proud, so beautiful! I kneel again,
A child, and plead to that unhardened heart,
By all the long past hours of priceless love,
To let my gushing soul pass forth in grace,
And bless thee in its parting!”—p. 99.

Hyllus is led to the altar, when, at that moment, Thoas stabs himself—declares his crime—and dies, after hearing that his mother has entered the poisonous cave under the temple; and Creusa, whose feelings have been throughout too vacillating, and too feebly marked, to excite much interest, is left weeping upon the shoulder of her brother.

We think we have done justice in our extracts to the beauty of many passages in this play. It is not so easy to convey the general impression of tameness in the characters, and heaviness in the conduct of the piece, which will, in our opinion, prevent its being a lasting favourite.

We have said that both these pieces fail in power to interest the feelings. With all its beauty, the *Tragedy* is wanting in the most essential requisite for that purpose—energy, and depth of feeling. In a like degree, though in a different manner, the *Comedy* wants the intricate and well-combined story,—the well-imagined character,—and the playful and pungent humour, that, in its own style, should rivet the attention with equal power.

Woman’s Wit is a comedy in five acts; but in spite of this pretension, and of some really fine writing, it is no more than an elegant trifle. Nothing can be more inartificial than the plot, which is made up of two stories so extremely alike, that they

seem counterparts of each other, and so unconnected, that they might easily and advantageously form two separate plays. As, for instance, Hero, the first heroine, offends her lover, Sir Valentine, by her indiscretion in the waltz; Helen, the second heroine, is suspected by her lover also for an indiscretion; the same gentleman—Lord Athunree—being the accuser of the one, and the offending partner of the other: both ladies are forsaken on the instant. Sir Valentine meets Hero again, dressed as a Quakeress, and falls desperately in love with her: Walsingham meets Helen in the disguise of a boy, and conceives a violent friendship for him. Both ladies, of course, plead their own cause. Hero, as the Quakeress Ruth, compels her lover to renew his offer to Hero, which he does—is accepted—and discovers, to his great surprise, that he has been faithful in his infidelity. Helen (accompanied by Walsingham as her second) challenges Lord Athunree to a duel; but on the ground, the fight is interrupted, and they are commanded to keep the peace in “God’s name and the queen’s:”—

“Stop; you are all our prisoners, sirs,
Sir William Sutton’s warrant makes you so;
Which here I show to you; surrender then,
And to his niece’s bear us company.”

At the house of Sir William Sutton, (Hero’s very silly uncle,) all the parties meet, we believe for the first time, and the fainting Helen is justified by Lewson, the agent through whose means Lord Athunree had involved her in suspicion. The same villainous, yet somewhat tame personage has formed a plan for carrying off Hero by force, and in this also, Lewson was to have been his assistant; but he being seized with remorse, relinquishes the plot upon the one lady, and exposes that upon the other; thus forming the only connecting link between the stories. Nor is there much interest in the characters, to counterbalance this defect. Hero is a fine girl, but her character wants variety, she does not change with her changed appearance, and therefore, there is not much in her transformation, to amuse us, or to give plausibility to the credulity of her lover.

Sir Valentine is quite preposterous; in one interview, he falls so vehemently in love with the Quakeress, as to give up his title, make over his fortune, change his dress, and his name—nay, his religion, for he turns Quaker—to please her; and in the next scene, we find him in considerable doubt whether, he would wish to be accepted or refused by Hero. Helen is by far the most poetical personage in the play. But the absence of those higher requisites for comedy, in which we consider this piece to be deficient, is in some degree atoned for by the beauty of the lan-

guage. It is easy, ornate, and elegant, not calculated perhaps to express energetic passion, not flexible enough for lightness and humour, but almost unrivalled in description; take for instance that of the dance :—

LORD ATHUNREE.

“ Her waist was in my custody ;
Her white arm hanging from my shoulder, where
Her hand did freely couch. ‘ Your game goes well !’
I whisper’d her ; ‘ play boldly, and ’tis your’s :
The measure this to set the outline off !
Give sway to thy rich figure ! Abandon thee
To the spirit of the dance ! Let it possess thee !
Float thee as air were footing for thee ! stud
Thy cheeks with smiles of fire ; and give thine eye
The lightning’s dazzling play ! fix them on mine,
That each do feed the other’s, like to tongues
With converse waking converse !”

FELTON.

“ Well ?—I see
Thy drift !”

LORD ATHUNREE.

“ Thou should’st have seen the issue on’t—
While, like a pupil at a task he loves,
Whose aptitude with eager will outstrips
His master’s bidding, she was twenty times
The thing I wished her ! How she rose and sank
With springy instep, while her yielding waist,
Well as her waving neck, her beauteous head—
Did show her fair, and falling shoulders off !
A world she looked and moved of passionate
Quick sense—of loveliness and joyousness,
And I, be sure, did show its reigning lord !
Nor with the measure did dominion cease ;
But when her drooping lids, relaxed steps,
Disparted lips, and colour vanishing,
Gave note she must give o’er—her languid form,
Close girdled by my arm, her hand in mine,
Her cheek for pillow on my shoulder laid,
I led her to a couch, where courtesy
Of course admitted tendance !”—p. 8.

The portrait of the master, from whom the disguised Helen learns the art of fencing, is free and spirited in its touch, conveying a most pleasing idea—and the more so, as the author tells us it is drawn from a living model :

“ A noble fellow that !—A soldier who
A mighty captain follow’d, for the strides

With which he led to glory—nay, from them
 Deserted not, when fortune backed a world,
 Marshall'd against her cast off favourite !
 Talk you of scars ?—that Frenchman bears on crown,
 Body and limb, his vouchers palpable,
 For many a thicket he has struggled thro'
 Of briery danger—wondering that he
 Came off with even life ; when right and left
 His mates dropp'd thick beside him. A true man !
 His rations with his master gone,—for he
 Was honour's soldier, that ne'er changes sides,—
 He left his country for a foreign one,
 To teach his gallant art, and earn a home.
 I know him to be honest, generous,
 High souled, and modest : every way a grace
 To the fine, martial nation, whence he sprang !" —p. 20.

Under this accomplished teacher, Helen practises fencing ; and the intensity of her desire for vengeance, is more powerfully conveyed in the following short passage, than in all the speeches she makes herself throughout the play :—

DE L'ÉPÉE.

" Yes ; by his looks he has a teen or twain
 To count ;—tho' never scholar study plied
 With manlier resolve and constancy,
 It often moves my wonder, that so slight
 And delicate a frame should undergo,
 What to robuster mould a thousand times
 I have mark'd was weariness. Scarce lays he down
 The foil, before he takes it up again,
 Some parry, feint, or lounge, unmaster'd yet,
 'To practise ;—which he does with zest so keen,
 I have thought, at times, that in his fancy's eye
 There stood before his point an enemy,
 The actor of some unatoned wrong,
 Whose heart each thrust was meant for.—p. 19.

We must give one more passage, the description which Walsingham gives to the disguised Helen of her likeness to her former self, in which the traces that sorrow leaves upon a young fair face, are exquisitely and pathetically rendered :—

" Hast thou never
 Remark'd me gazing in abstraction on thee,
 As tho' upon perusal of thy face,
 While seem'd mine eye intent, my soul did pore
 Upon some other thing ?—I have done it oft—
 Will do it once again ! Your eyes are her's,
 In form and line, but sunk ; a darkness too,
 Sits not disparagingly tho'—'neath thine ;

Her's were two starry brilliants set in pearl !
 The outline of the nose is quite the same,
 But that of thine is sharper—'tis thy sex,
 The mouth is very like—oh, very like !
 But there's a touch—a somewhat deep one too—
 Of pensiveness. The cast of her's was sweetness,
 Enlocking full content. The cheek is not
 At all alike !—'tis high ; and lank below,
 And sallow—not a dimple in't—all contrast
 To the rich flower'd and velvet lawn of hers.

* * * * *

I spoke not of thy hair—it is a wood
 Run wild compar'd to her's, and thrice as deep
 I' the shade.—Yet, you are very like her !—p. 107.

We shall now take our leave of these two eminent authors, regretting that our observations have not been more entirely favourable ; but in the confident hope that their career is far from closed, and that we shall yet receive from them works in every respect worthy to be placed amongst the choicest treasures of our literature.

- ART. IX.—1. *Ensayo sobre la Supremacia del Papa, &c. Essay on the Supremacy of the Pope, especially with regard to the Institution of Bishops.* By the Rev. Dr. Joseph Ignatius Moreno, Archdeacon of the Metropolitan Church of Lima, Author of the "*Peruvian Letters.*" Lima. 1836.
2. *Panegirico de la esclarecida Virgen Santa Catalina de Sena, &c. Panegyric of the glorious Virgin Saint Catherine of Siena.* By Dr. D. Miguel Calixto del Corro, published . . . principally for the purpose of inspiring a mortal hatred of the monster Schism, and of convincing all men of the necessity of obedience to the Sovereign Pontiff, for the maintenance of true Catholicism, and the obtaining of life eternal. Buenos Ayres. 1837.
3. *Reflexoes imparciaes sobre a Fulla do Trono é as respostas das Camaras legislativas de 1836.* Impartial reflections upon the speech from the throne, and on the addresses in reply from the legislative chambers of 1836. Rio de Janeiro. 1837.
4. *Resposta do Provincial dos Franciscanos do Rio de Janeiro, &c. Answer of the Provincial of the Franciscans of Rio de Janeiro to the questions treated in the memoir sent with a message from the government for his opinion.* Rio de Janeiro. 1837.

5. *Memoria sobre o Direito da Primazia do Soberano Pontifice Romano, &c. Memoir upon the Right of Primacy of the Sovereign Roman Pontiff, in the confirmation and canonical institutions of all Bishops.* Translated from the French. Rio. 1837.

6. *Selecta Catholica.* No. 8. Rio. 1837.

THE learned author of the first work on this list, remarks that amongst those who take up his work, there will be some, "who valuing only what comes from Paris or London, will throw it aside for no other reason but that it is a work written at Lima, and contains no curious narratives, no flaming theories, and no capricious novelties in matters of religion, philosophy, politics, or finance."—(p. xiv.) To us these are the very circumstances that particularly interest us in his work, and in the others now lying before us. To find, in works published beyond the wide Atlantic, the very faith that is taught not only in London or in Paris, but in Rome itself, free from the slightest trace of that novelty which is impressed upon every institution in the new states of South America, defended and illustrated with a learning, a zeal, and a generosity which would do honour to any country in Europe,—is to us really refreshing, and a source of sincere gratification. Gladly as we should hail such works, if published in Paris or London, they have for us a special charm from the distance they have travelled.

Authority is not generally supposed to act in a ratio inverse of distance from its centre, especially that which has no fleets or armies to support it, but only the influence of moral arguments and feelings. That Great Britain, mistress of the ocean, and the Tyre of modern nations, should keep in subjection countries remote as the antipodes, can scarcely be matter of astonishment; her thousand prows not only bear, but can enforce her commands. And yet the more distant parts of her transmarine possessions have more than once given proof, that when consciousness of strength has reached its proper pitch, there will be a tendency in them to break the connecting link,—the cord, so to speak, which supplied the vital energy from the circulation of the mother country, and to assert an independent individuality of existence. But the Sovereign Pontiff,—His vicar, whose kingdom is not of this world,—unarmed with temporal power, beyond the narrow limits of his states, without recourse to spiritual weapons—for with one grand exception, the thunderbolts of the Church's anathemas have been laid up for many days in her arsenals,—he maintains undisturbed his sacred dominion from east to west, and need not fear its overthrow, either from the caprice of rulers or from the growing independence of spirit in distant nations.

We believe we are correct in asserting, that the separation of the Spanish dependences from that country, was hailed by bibli-cals, missionary societies, and other brokers in religious stock, as producing a new and favourable market for their wares. Bales of bibles, and chests of tracts, were poured in with every fresh supply of Birmingham hardware or Manchester prints, and every commercial envoy had a *vis-à-vis* on his voyage in the shape of a religious agent. Toleration—that is, the free importation of all the brawling sects that tear one another to pieces in England, was confidently anticipated; and a country just cleared of monasteries could not but be considered in prime condition for a crop of presbyterianism or bible reading.* But seriously speaking, appearances foreboded not well for religion. The Holy See, with every other European power, hesitated to break its harmony with Spain, for the recognition of the embryo republics, which disputed more among themselves than with the parent land. The succession of bishops was almost if not entirely interrupted, and Spain claimed the right to nominate to the vacant sees, while the revolted provinces refused to accept of its nominees. The hatred towards Spain caused the banishment of many clergy and religious, who were natives of that country, and thus the supply of ecclesiastics was become very scanty.

It was natural to expect that, while affairs were in this condition, some would be found to re-echo, in the western hemisphere, those doctrines of religious independence which in some parts of the eastern had been considered a part of the code of political liberalism. And no doubt, to many who understand not the spirit of the Catholic religion, an ardour for civil freedom, with an equal zeal for subjection to a foreign Pontiff, may appear an anomaly. The objections made by the See of Rome to the repeated applications for bishops, so long as the struggle continued between the parent country and its dependencies, was naturally displeasing to the latter; and a party arose, that desired to see the Churches of South America established on the

* At a meeting of the Bible Society in September, 1824, the Bishop of Lichfield and Coventry, (Ryder) is reported to have "congratulated the meeting upon the prospect now opening to their view in Columbia; and contrasted the *progress which the society was now making in that newly-formed government* with the spirit of bigotry and persecution that disgraced the first introduction of Christianity among that people. The consequence was, that despotism, civil and religious, had covered that land, and impaired her moral energies—had made it the seat of superstition—the very fastness of Papal power: (cheers,) but the storm had at length subsided, and they were now permitted, under the guidance of Him, 'who guided the whirlwind and directed the storm,' to spread through that country the glorious tidings of 'peace on earth, and good will towards men.'" (cheers.) In a part of the report read at this meeting, it is said that the fields of South America are "already white for the harvest." See report of the meeting quoted from the *Morning Chronicle*, in *Cobbett's Weekly Register*, September 18, 1824.

model of the schismatical one at Utrecht, paying merely a nominal submission to the successor of St. Peter. These dangerous principles were fanned from without. The restless politician, M. de Pradt, addressed the Mexican government, while it was treating with Rome for the appointment of bishops, exhorting it to make such a concordat with the Holy See, as should leave it for the future independent in the election and institution of bishops, and in the government of the churches; and should the Holy See refuse, as was naturally to be expected, then to make every protestation of fidelity and union, and proceed to nomination without its concurrence. In this wicked proposal another unfortunate member of the same school, the Canon Villanueva went farther still. For, in a work of which thousands of copies were disseminated over all the new states, he denied even the necessity of the preliminary step recommended by De Pradt; and amidst a torrent of abuse against the Popes, and a futile attempt to show that they have never held themselves bound by their concordats when made, advised the infant republics to assert their ecclesiastical together with their political freedom.

Fortunately, good sense, as well as sound religious principles, ruled in the councils of the states; not one swerved from its duty. They preferred waiting with patience till time and circumstances should allow the Vicar of Christ to give bishops to their widowed churches; nor were they long disappointed. So soon as the hold which Spain had on her colonies was reduced to protests and protocols, in spite of all opposition and resistance on the part of the former, the Holy See proceeded to treat with the latter for the filling up of vacant sees. By degrees, Chili, Peru, Mexico, the Argentine republic, and the other states, have been supplied with pastors; the Jesuits and other religious orders have been reinstated, and the entire continent essentially Catholic, is firmly knitted in sympathies as in belief with the rest of the Church.

It is chiefly to answer the calumnies of Villanueva and Pereira, that the first work on the list at the head of our article was written. The ponderous and inaccurate quarto of the latter author,* had been translated from the Portuguese into Spanish, at Lima, in 1833, but was received with little or no encouragement by the public. Don José Ignacio Moreno has done the work of refutation solidly and efficaciously. His volume is only a second part, though complete in itself, to a first Essay published six years earlier, treating on the great question of the supremacy, which we regret we have not been fortunate enough to procure.

* *Demonstração theologica, canonica e historica do Direito dos Metropolitanos de Portugal, para confirmarem e mandarem sagrar os bispos suffraganeos.* Lisboa, 1769.

We own that we have been so agreeably surprised by the portion now before us, as anxiously to desire a perusal of the preceding. In the difficulty under which we necessarily labour of procuring accurate information on the ecclesiastical affairs of those distant countries, we own that our views were very limited respecting the state of theological science there. The perusal of this work has completely set us at ease on this subject. We are quite sure, that our brethren the clergy of the New World, will not want assistance from Europe to fight their battles against infidelity, heresy, or any system of error however artful. Whatever crisis moral or political may arise in those states,—however the safety, the unity, or the rights of the Church may seem threatened, we feel confident that its interests are in good and able hands, who will support it as zealously and as efficaciously as they have done during the past. Whatever learning or ingenuity on the part of corruption and error may be imported from Europe, whether in the shape of Protestant tracts or of jansenistical treatises, there will be no need of sending them the antidote after the poison; the soil will produce it powerfully and abundantly on the spot. The author of the work before us has manifestly the command of a good library of theological literature, and knows how to use it. To a close and sound, but still a clear and simple reasoning, he unites an accurate and extensive knowledge of all that ecclesiastical history can furnish towards solving the important question of which he treats. We must, however content ourselves with presenting to our readers only a very summary and imperfect outline of his work.

After having briefly explained the state of the question, he proceeds to lay down what he calls his fundamental proposition, in these words. “The right of instituting or confirming bishops, according to the constitution of the Church, belongs exclusively to the Popes; and from his supreme authority flowed, as from its proper source, that which was at one time exercised, with his consent, by patriarchs, primates, archbishops and metropolitans, in and out of councils.”—(p. 7.) This proposition is proved in two chapters, in the first of which the Pope’s right of giving canonical institution is proved to be a necessary prerogative of his primacy; and in the second, the derivation of that right to inferior authorities is demonstrated. Here arises an important inquiry into the meaning and intention of the fourth and sixth Canons of the Council of Nicea, which our author treats in three long chapters, full of learning, and excellently arranged. The third chapter in particular, in which the right claimed and exercised by the Popes to confirm the bishops of different coun-

tries, is fully proved, is at once well arranged and abounds with interesting and convincing materials.

The next question is, were the Popes justified in resuming or reserving to themselves the right of instituting bishops, when the necessities or good of the Church required it; and do they deserve, for having done so, the charge of spoliation or usurpation made against them by Pereira or Villanueva? (p. 172.) This point is treated with great ability and an accurate knowledge of canon law. He next examines the motives which not only justified the Holy See, but rendered it imperative for it to resume its original right of reserving to itself the confirmation of bishops; insisting principally, and we think justly, upon the necessity of this practice to secure the liberty of the Church. For without it, the most unfit characters might have been thrust into sees, nor were chapters often sufficiently strong to cope with the temporal power that not unfrequently supported usurpation.

The next question is of a more delicate and complicated character. Do the concordats entered into by the See of Rome with sovereign princes, deprive them of their right of institution; or is the former so bound by them as to be allowed, under no circumstances, to suspend or revoke them, without the imputation of breach of faith? (p. 208.) This we regard as one of the best portions of our author's work, whether we consider the question of right, or the historical examinations to which it gives rise. In the first chapter upon it, he fully confutes the specious theories of Van Espen, on the question on whom does the right of nomination devolve, in case the sovereign, who, by concordat, exercised the right of nomination, is incapacitated from using it? In the second, he shows that the concordat is essentially in the form not of an equal pact between the two parties, but of a concession from one to the other. For, the right in them secured to temporal princes, of nominating to vacant sees, is in truth granted and permitted to them by the sovereign Pontiff, while that of confirming or instituting, which is reserved to the latter, is already his own inherent prerogative. The calumnious accusation against various Popes, in which Villanueva indulges, are completely confuted.

The remaining portion of the work applies more particularly to the circumstances in which the new States of South America are, or were placed. For, the fourth question is, how far a want of communication between the Holy See, or a refusal on its part to appoint bishops, can authorize metropolitans to proceed to nomination? (p. 256.) The fifth discusses whether bishops, so nominated, would exercise valid acts of jurisdiction or not? (p. 306.) The last examines what would have to be done in an extreme

case of impossibility of recurrence to the See of Peter. (p. 318.) On all these points the same soundness of views is displayed, with the same abundant application of historical precedents. The work concludes with copious biographical notes upon the different authors confuted in its course.

The composition of the work, without being in the least shackled with scholastic forms, partakes of that distinctness, method and closeness, which the old school education was so admirably calculated to give, and the absence of which is so plainly felt in modern works on controversy and philosophy. We close it with sincere respect for its author, and a hope that it has received the encouragement in his own country which it deserves. The first section or volume, published like the second, at Lima, was soon reprinted at Buenos Ayres; and was highly applauded by the Valparaiso and Jago papers, as well as by bishops and clergy.* The sentiments of the learned Archdeacon are thus proved to be in accordance with those of his fellow-countrymen, applying the term to the inhabitants of different states, but of one continent. When a publication entitled, "An exact memorial" *Memorial ajustado*, suggesting similar views to those confuted by him, appeared at Buenos Ayres, it was most ably confuted by a layman, Dr. Tomas Manuel de Anchorena, in an opinion dated March 22, 1834. And even before this, the Chamber of Justice of the Republic of Chili, in giving the *Exequatur* to the Bulls for the consecration of the Bishop of Penco, Snr. Cienfuegos, had rejected and refuted its opinions.

While the republican states of South America had shewn themselves wisely ruled in what regarded ecclesiastical affairs, at a very dangerous period of their history, the empire of Brazil had not shown a similar discretion. What was impiously suggested to the former has been actually attempted in the latter; but only to give opportunity for a noble triumph to the Church, and for a splendid demonstration of public opinion in favour of its rights. All the other pamphlets in our list refer to this state, at least indirectly; and we shall endeavour to present our readers with an account of their matter, assisted by other original sources of information, which are at our command.

Brazil, which is governed by a minor, has a stronger right than any constitutional state under ordinary circumstances, to exonerate itself on its ministers, for the foolish—not to say irreligious—course which it exposed itself to the danger of running. Indeed, we cannot but observe, how in modern times every attempt to quarrel with the Holy See on the subject of its rights,

* See their testimonials, given p. 458 of the 2nd volume.

especially in episcopal appointments, has been the work of favourite ministers who have grown all powerful, rather than the sovereigns whom they served ; more the effects of private spites and grudges, than of princely ambition. The infamous Carvalho, Marquis of Pombal in Portugal, Tanucci at Naples, Campomanes and Urquijo in Spain, Kaunitz at Vienna, are lamentable examples in the course of half a century, of the mischiefs which the corrupt principles or base passions of a minister may bring down upon the Church of his country, under the shelter of weak and easily deluded minds. We are willing to believe that the conduct of the Brazilian ministry arose rather from an unwise hope of intimidating the Holy See, than from any serious intention of proceeding to the extremities which they pretended in the affair whereof we are going to treat. Our materials will be drawn from the third tract quoted above, the "Impartial Reflections on the Speech from the Throne," which we shall afterwards see has received the approbation of the Brazilian public.

The regency of that empire, upon a vacancy of the See of Rio Janeiro, we believe in 1833, proposed to the Court of Rome, as a fit person to fill it, Dr. Antonio Maria de Moura. The Sovereign Pontiff refused to ratify the choice, or give the Bulls of canonical Institution to the elect. With respect to the personal character of the individual named and refused, we pretend to no knowledge. There were sufficient grounds in his avowed opinions to justify the conduct of the Holy See. The annual report of the Minister of Justice, May 10th, 1836, acknowledges that there was "some canonical impediment in the nominee, (and who amongst us," adds the author of the pamphlet, "is ignorant of this fact?) but of the sort which it is customary to dispense with." Farther on he owns that the candidate held some points of doctrine "at variance with the Holy Father." The Minister of Justice, two days later, attributed the objections to opinions given by Dr. Moura contrary to the discipline of the Church. Any Catholic will consider these reasons sufficient in all conscience to justify a demur on the Pope's part ; and whoever understands the jealousy with which the supreme executive power of the Church watches over the integrity of its faith in the most distant provinces, will not be surprised at the noble and unyielding conduct displayed by its present chief ruler.

The Regency seemed determined from the beginning to make this a trial of strength between the civil and ecclesiastical powers, and to see how far it would be possible to make the latter sacrifice its scruples, and even principles, to the desire of preserving good understanding with the former. In the annual report of

the Minister of Foreign Affairs, Coutinho, to the Chambers in 1834, he thus explains the state of the contest. "Dr. A. M. de Moura having been named bishop of the diocese of Rio Janeiro, on sufficient grounds, a delay has occurred in expediting the bulls in the usual style. But the Imperial Government hopes, that in virtue of new instructions sent to its agent at Rome, they will shortly be expedited; *as becomes the dignity of the empire, and the individual interests of the Court of Rome.*" Here is no intention or desire manifested to remove the canonical grounds of objection to the individual chosen, nor to satisfy the Holy See that its scruples concerning his orthodoxy were unfounded. The dignity of the empire required that the ecclesiastical authority should implicitly yield to its dictates, however opposed to justice and religion; otherwise the interests of the Holy See should so suffer as to subdue its resolution, and force it to submission.

They little knew the See of Hildebrand who reasoned thus. Negotiations upon such principles necessarily failed, and the ministry had recourse to stronger measures. In the report for 1835 the matter is again reported in the following terms. "As yet the Holy Father has not ordered the expedition of the Bulls giving institution to Dr. Moura, named Bishop of Rio by the regency, in the name of his majesty the emperor. The imperial government having shown its sincerest and liveliest desire to treat with becoming politeness and respect the Holy See, is firmly persuaded that his Holiness, *considering the serious consequences which the refusal of these Bulls will bring after them, will not fail to yield to the energetic representations, made to him by our minister, and to the ultimatum of our government.*" Before proceeding to explain what these measures were, which could not fail to produce the desired effects, we must not omit a clear proof now given that so far from wishing to smooth away difficulties and remove the conscientious scruples of the Holy Father, it was the intention of the regency to force his consent in spite of them. His Holiness, anxious on his part to make every becoming step towards conciliation, had, in the mean time, sent instructions to his internuncio at Rio, to ask for such explanations from Dr. Moura himself, as might allow him to accede to the wishes of the ministry. The report just quoted was made in May, and on the 10th of June, before the papal minister had addressed himself to Dr. Moura, the latter received an official note from Sr. Alves Branco, foreign minister, to the effect that "the Imperial government having learnt that the Chargé-d'affaires of the Holy See had received orders to ask an answer or explanation from him (Dr. Moura), the regency, in the name of the

emperor, declared to him, that it would be very displeasing (*muito desagradavel*) to it, if he agreed to such a demand." To which the episcopal candidate answered in a manner, which proves how worthy he was of being the nominee of such a ministry; he said "that no such application had been made to him by the internuncio; but that if it had, it would have been useless, as he would never have taken so indiscreet a step as to answer it, covering himself thereby with ridicule in the eyes of his fellow-citizens." This conduct proves how far conciliation was remote from the views of the party; for from the earliest ages the right of the Roman Pontiff has been acknowledged, to ask explanations of an elected bishop, on points of faith. Thus early in the sixth century Pope Agapitus refused to confirm Anthimus, of Trebizond, elected to the see of Constantinople, because he refused to sign the formulary of faith enjoined by Pope Hormisdas on the bishops of the east, and even deposed him from the see he held.

But let us see what were the energetic representations made by the Brazilian government to the Holy See. They consisted of one of the most ridiculous, and at the same time one of the most indecent productions of modern diplomacy. For as to the latter characteristic, it is described by the able author of the *Impartial Reflections*, as "launching forth a quantity of words, phrases, and sentiments, gross, unbecoming, injurious, schismatical, heretical, and irreligious: thus not only offending the venerable grey hairs of the illustrious aged chief of the outraged Roman court . . . not only the supreme ruler of the Universal Church, the shepherd of the Catholic flock, the head of the religion and Church of Brazil, but likewise offending sometimes the dignity and honour of all the Brazilian nation and its government, which thus appears to degrade itself by employing the vilest and most miserable means, in its most delicate and important transactions." (p. 24.) This may appear a severe censure, but it is fully borne out by comparison with the ridiculousness of this piece of diplomatic intercourse. The deputy, Sr. Vasconcellos asserted in the Chamber, that the note presented by the Brazilian minister to the Papal Cabinet was a copy and parody of Lord Strangford's note to the Sublime Porte, of August 11, 1823. This assertion appeared too absurd to be believed: the very idea that a Catholic power, in addressing the Holy See, should have chosen as its model the strong remonstrance of a Protestant to a Mohammedan state, and yet talk of having used *becoming reverence* in its intercourse, was monstrous; while the poverty of invention in the government that could condescend to so paltry an imitation, was absolutely ridiculous. Hence even the author of the *Reflections* declares that the answer of Sr. Limpo de Abrêo, given two days

after, that he could not consider such a misapplication possible, appeared to him quite sufficient. Afterwards, however, he procured Meisel's *Cours de Style Diplomatique*, Paris, 1826, in the second volume of which he found Lord Strangford's note, "and with utter dismay, astonishment, and pain, found how true the charge of plagiarism was." The two notes were written in French, so that the comparison may be more easily made. The following are extracts from the two.

Note from the Brazilian Minister to the Holy See, dated 23rd September, 1835.

"Il semble donc que se soit la volonté du Saint-Siège qui a fait naître la crise où il se trouve à l'égard du Brésil, et cette volonté ne peut avoir d'autre base que l'erreur.

Le Saint-Siège est dans l'erreur s'il croit pouvoir, en gagnant du temps, exercer à la longue la faculté négative dans la nomination des Evêques du Brésil. Dans la crise actuelle, vouloir gagner du temps par des moyens dilatoires, c'est perdre sans espoir de retour, des chances que d'autres combinaisons ont fait naître, mais qu'elles ne sauraient reproduire.

Le Saint-Siège est dans l'erreur s'il doute de l'unité des vues, d'intentions et de vœux qui préside aux déterminations du Gouvernement du Brésil; s'il doute de l'Assemblée Législative, la Chambre des Députés, la première à reconnaître en principes et en termes formels la justice des réclamations faites en vain depuis plus de deux ans auprès du Saint-Siège, pour éviter une rupture qui d'ailleurs devient inévitable.

Le Saint-Siège est dans l'erreur s'il croit inépuisable la patience de la Régence au nom de S. M. l'Empereur D. Pedro II.

Le Saint-Siège est dans l'erreur lorsqu'il s' imagine que son intérêt à faire valoir des prétensions exa-

Note from Lord Strangford to the Ottoman Porte, dated 11th of August, 1823.

"Il semble donc que ce soit la volonté de la Porte qui s'oppose au rétablissement des relations de bienveillance réciproque, et cette volonté ne peut avoir d'autre base que l'erreur.

La Porte est dans l'erreur si elle croit améliorer sa position en gagnant du temps. Dans la crise où se trouve l'Empire Ottoman, vouloir gagner du temps, c'est perdre sans espoir de retour des chances que d'heureuses combinaisons ont fait naître, mais qu'elles ne sauraient reproduire.

La Sublime Porte est dans l'erreur si elle doute de l'unité des vues, d'intentions et de vœux qui préside aux déterminations des cours alliées; si elle doute de l'unanimité de toutes les puissances, l'Angleterre, la première à reconnaître en principes et termes formels la justice des réclamations de la Russie contre les innovations, les vexations et infractions, auxquelles le commerce et la navigation sont exposés.

La Sublime Porte est dans l'erreur si elle croit inépuisable la patience de l'Empereur de Russie.

La Sublime Porte est dans l'erreur lorsqu'elle s' imagine que son intérêt à faire valoir ses prétensions

gérés n'a pas des bornes. C'est en insistant avec raideur et hors de saison sur des prérogatives consenties dans les temps obscurs par l'ignorance et l'intérêt des princes, que la Saint-Siège court le risque de voir annuler celles même sur lesquelles se reposent aujourd'hui ses relations avec le Brésil.

à la charge de la Russie, lui commande de différer le rétablissement de ses relations amicales avec cette puissance. C'est en insistant avec raideur et hors de saison que la Porte court le risque de voir annuler celles même sur lesquelles se reposent aujourd'hui ses relations avec la Russie."—p. 23.

The stupidity of this burlesque, particularly in paragraph the third, is beyond measure, where, for "the unanimity of the allied powers," we have substituted, "the unanimity of the Brazilian Government;" as if the Pope had ever founded his delay in making out the Bulls upon any divisions in the government. Such were the energetic representations of the Brazilian Cabinet; its ultimatum was worthy of them. It was that, if his Holiness did not yield to its demands within the term of two months, the Brazilian empire would separate itself from the communion of the Church of Rome. The result was what might have been anticipated by any but the framers of the "energetic representations;" before the expiration of the appointed term, the Pope replied, that it was out of his power to accede to the nomination made for the diocese of Rio.

This declaration of the Sovereign Pontiff, was communicated to the Brazilian public, in the speech from the throne in 1836, which forms the theme of the *Impartial Reflections*. The portion of it which relates to this matter, is couched in the following terms:—

"1. I cannot conceal from you, that his Holiness, after two years spent in reciprocal explanations, resolved not to accept the presentation of the bishop elect of this diocese.

"2. The government has on its side law and justice, but his Holiness obeys his conscience. After this decision, the government considered itself exonerated from using farther condescension with the Holy See; without, however, being wanting in the respect and obedience due to the Head of the Universal Church.

"3. In your hands it is, ("addressing the Chambers,") to free the Brazilian Catholic from the difficulty, and, in many instances, the impossibility, of begging (*mendiar*) at such a distance, relief which ought not to be refused within the empire itself.

"4. So holy is our religion, so well calculated the system of ecclesiastical government, that being reconcileable with every system of civil government, its discipline may be modified for the interests of the State, without ever compromising the essentials of religion itself. Notwithstanding this collision with the Holy Father, our amicable relations continue with the court of Rome."

The object of these paragraphs is sufficiently apparent, and

the fallacies of which they are composed are but slightly disguised. The ministry had made a vain boastful threat against the head of the Church. To use the expression of the primate of Brazil, in the senate, they had inscribed the circle of Popilius round the apostolic chair, and declared, that either he must confirm their nomination in the space of two months, or see that empire separated from the Holy See. So far as threatening, or, to use a plainer and more expressive word, so far as bullying went, they were perfectly competent; but the successor of St. Peter, having refused the first alternative, the ministers had recourse to the Legislature for assistance in carrying into effect their menace, and severing the country from the papal communion. They suggest the necessity of making such provisions as will enable the subjects of Brazil to dispense with recourse to Rome. (Par. 3.) This refers to matrimonial dispensations, as we shall have occasion to show. They desire, moreover, that the discipline of the Church should be so modified as to meet the awkward position into which their blundering conduct had cast the government; that is, that bishops named by them, should be consecrated and instituted without farther confirmation. (Par. 4.)

The two objects of these two paragraphs are clearly explained by the light they receive from the fourth pamphlet on our list, containing the excellent answer of the Franciscan Provincial Frei Antonio de Sancta Mafalda, to a request presented to him, September 1, 1836, that he would give his opinion on a memoir forwarded to him at the same time. The substance of this document, he writes, may be reduced to three articles.

“ 1. Can bishops nominated by the government, be legitimately invested with possession of the bishopric, and with episcopal jurisdiction, solely in virtue of such nomination ?

“ 2. Are matrimonial impediments dispensable by the authority, which, on the bishop's demise, exercises his jurisdiction, as the vicar capitular, or administrator of the See ?

“ 3. Can a bishop, so named, have right to any part of the episcopal revenues, under either of these titles ?”

To each of these queries, which evidently embody the more covert suggestions of the speech from the throne, the reverend provincial answers, clearly, solidly, and withal most prudently. Throughout his reply, there is not the remotest allusion to passing events, but the cases are treated abstractedly, as though no application of them could be intended. He candidly states the opinion of canonists, who differ from him, and solidly confutes them. He learnedly discusses the canons of councils and constitutions of Sovereign Pontiffs, on the necessity of confirmation, and concludes against Osorius, that in no case, with-

out the guilt of usurpation and the danger of schism, could a bishop named by a government, empowered to this act by concordat or usage, presume to exercise any act of jurisdiction, without having first received approbation and institution from the Holy See. On the subject of dispensation, he is more reserved, in consequence of the conflict of respectable divines, and the variety of provisions made by the Popes for different emergencies. Still his opinion is not such as to favour the desires or intentions of the government. The reply to the third query, results from the answers to the preceding. No bishop elect can have a claim to more emoluments than he whose places he occupies, that is the vicar capitular, not the bishop.

On this side the ministry were manifestly foiled. But our object in quoting this document here, was not so much to demonstrate this point, as to unmask the desires and views of the government in the speech from the throne. As to the fallacies it contains, the author of the *Impartial Reflections* has admirably laid them open. Many of his remarks we have already incorporated in our narrative. For instance, to prove that ministers did not and could not believe that law and justice were on their side, as they assert in par. 2; he quotes the declaration of ministers given above, that canonical objections existed against the approbation of the individual elected, and their having never proposed other motives for pressing their point beyond the honour of the empire and the interests of the Holy See. But the best proof of the conscious falsehood of the assertion, that law and justice were on the side of the government, results from the conferences held between ministers and the papal resident, in which the former declared, "that in truth the nomination had not been a good one; that the government would not make such a one again, but that being made, it must be maintained!"—(*Impart. Reflec.* p. 10.)

The most important and interesting part of the subject yet remains. How was this appeal to the Legislature received by the Chambers and by the public? As if to prepare for themselves a greater disgrace, the ministers, as we have seen, boasted to the Pope the unanimity of the legislative assembly in supporting their views of the contest between him and them. The result sadly belied their pretensions.

The Chamber of Deputies replied as follows:—

"The Chamber laments the state of collision with the Holy See, in which the imperial government is placed; and hopes, that without injury to the royalties of the crown, or compromise of national interests, the government will provide, that our relations with the head of the Universal Church shall not be altered; and, therefore, con-

siders that, for the present, it is not competent to take any other measures."

The Senate answered in these terms :—

"It is painful to the Senate to learn, that the delicate conscience of his Holiness does not allow him to approve the presentation of a bishop of this diocese. Still the assurance which your Imperial Majesty gives of the continuance of amicable relations with the Court of Rome, the respect and obedience which Y. I. M. protests, (as was to be expected), to the Holy Father, as visible head of the Universal Church, give the Senate well-grounded hopes that the prudence and wisdom of Y. I. M. will employ such mild measures as, without impairing the dignity of the nation, will reconcile these differences. The Senate thus does not consider itself called upon to propose at present efficacious measures to maintain the dignity and rights of your Imperial Majesty's throne."

To understand better the sense of these answers, it must be noticed, that the real state of the question had never been laid before the Chambers. Excepting the annual reports above quoted, in 1834 and 1835, most of the members could know little or nothing about it. It was the publication before us which fully opened their eyes and those of the public. Ministers had made the emperor declare, that *law and justice* were on one side, and only private scruples of conscience on the other. On this *ex parte* statement alone, they had to form a judgment. And yet the violent, extreme views of the ministry were so transparent through the measured phrases of the speech, that both houses declined acceding to its wishes. They naturally desire that the dignity of the Crown and the interest of the nation should be preserved, in a case where they were unhesitatingly assured that law and justice supported them. But even then they manifestly disapproved of the past conduct of the ministry, and refused to support them in their future projects. They regret that any discord should have taken place, and reject the idea proposed in the speech (par. 4), of modifying the relations between the empire and the court of Rome. They decline taking into consideration the matter placed in their hands by the regency, declaring themselves incompetent to take cognizance of it at present. This was all virtually disapproving the course proposed by the executive, especially when joined with the express desire that *mild measures* should be employed,—that is, measures of an exactly opposite character from those hitherto pursued. The debates in both Chambers confirm this view. In the Deputies, a motion was negatived for going into a more detailed and specific examination of the measures suggested in the speech : and the speeches of many senators and deputies were

eminently Catholic. The rights of the Holy See were ably protected, without an accurate acquaintance with the facts of the present case.

Two expressions in the addresses gave rise to considerable discussion. The first was the epithet *delicate* applied to the Pope's conscience, because the Portuguese word *melindroso* was equivocal, and might appear to bear the signification of *nice* or *precise*. But the Marquis de Maricá, of whose character we have formed a high estimate from the perusal of his *Maximas e Pensamentos*, &c. (*Rio de Janeiro*, 1837), well remarked, that no one would for a moment imagine that a grave assembly like the senate, treating of so delicate a matter, could apply the word in an offensive sense to the Pope. The other expression was, "*for the present*," inserted in the addresses by the committees which prepared them in both Chambers. Some thought that it might seem to hold out a threat against the Holy See, as though, on some future occasion, the Chambers might proceed to farther extremities. This interpretation, however, was overruled, and the phrase was understood to imply nothing more than that, *as matters stood then*, they saw no ground for interference to defend the honour of the state.

The voice of the legislative body manifestly condemned, from the outset, the precipitate and indecent conduct of ministers, and admitted the rights of the Holy See to use its liberty of approving, or not, the nomination made: and this before the entire case had been made public. But the appearance of our pamphlet, and especially the publication in it of the Strangford-Brazilian Note, produced a louder peal of that popular opinion, which all along had warmly espoused the side of ecclesiastical independence against ministerial tyranny, and had approved the Pope's objections to the imperial nominee. In the *Jornal do Commercio*, of Saturday, May 20, 1837, we have a full report of a debate in the Chamber of Deputies, which turned upon the foreign policy of ministers. Sr. Carneiro Leão censured its conduct in exchanging the residents at Rome and Lisbon, because, he said, "after the publication of a note from the former minister to the Holy See, of a nature to discredit Brazil with every court of Europe, it did not seem a proper moment for promoting him to the rank of envoy-extraordinary or minister-plenipotentiary to a court at which there were delicate interests to maintain." Sr. Limpo de Abreu, the champion of ministers on a former occasion, again rose in their defence. With respect to the note, he said he did not pretend to defend it, though he did not consider it a sufficient motive for striking the writer off the diplomatic list. Again, he repeated, he would not attempt to justify it, but

still thought there was a mistake. The occasions of Lord Strangford's and of the Brazilian government's negotiations were too dissimilar to allow the supposition that one copied the other's note. The only resemblance consisted in the expressions, "the Ottoman Porte is mistaken," and "the Holy See is mistaken." (laughter.) Sr. Calmon then rose, and commenced with these words:—"Sir, Heaven grant me on this occasion the marvellous *sang-froid*, the inimitable disembarassment, with which the noble ex-minister of foreign affairs has just defended the note to the Grand Turk, which one of our diplomatic agents has addressed to the Holy Father. I will speak of this affair presently." In fact, after other matters he reverts to this.

"The noble deputy (Carneiro de Leão), speaking of one of our envoys who addressed to the Holy See a note nearly copied from that which Lord Strangford presented to the Ottoman Porte, asks why he has been removed to Lisbon. I will venture to give the explanation he desires. He was removed—I beg pardon, he was promoted—for this very reason, that he had treated the Holy Father as the Grand Turk had been treated. I cannot persuade myself that that diplomatist, an able man, would have been guilty of so wretched a plagiarism, and have insulted the head of the Church, without being put up to it by government. . . . I characterize the plagiarism as wretched, because if the style of the English ambassador suited the representative of the civilization and power of Europe in addressing the Sultan of Constantinople, certainly the same style (and even more exasperating and more insulting in some sentences) could not become the representative of a Christian nation addressing the Supreme Pontiff. Gentlemen, the history of this note is disgraceful to Brazil. I know that when the court of Rome received it, the Holy Father, justly hurt, ordered it to be communicated to the diplomatic body resident in Rome, which, if not the most influential, is, at least, the most diplomatic court in Europe, and exacted from Voltaire himself the praise of high breeding. The diplomatic body expressed to His Holiness the feelings of disgust which the unbecoming character of that note had produced in its members; and I know likewise, that the Hanoverian minister, who indirectly represents His Britannic Majesty, was peculiarly emphatic in expressing his condolence at the proceedings of our envoy. This individual was placed in a false position at Rome, and found himself acting alone."

The honourable deputy continued some time longer commenting most severely upon the insult to the Holy See; but we have given sufficient of his speech, which received no answer, to shew how far the ministers could carry out their boastful threat of pushing the war against the Holy See with an undivided Chamber of Deputies.

But the people were, in fact, against them. The liberal paper, *O sete d'Abril* (the 7th of April), in its number for May 27,

1837, republishes, in Portuguese, the two celebrated notes, heading them with the direction, "For Sr. Limpo d'Abr eu, the member who denied the identity or close resemblance of the two notes." But in an extraordinary number, dated July 10, we have a bolder and stronger expression of the horror which the projected schism produced in the public mind. It consists in a correspondence, which, in addition to its own observations, has been the means of communicating to us a long extract of the *Echo*, a Lisbon paper, deprecating, in the strongest terms, the schismatical conduct of the Portuguese government. The correspondent writes as follows :—

"The object [of the Lisbon question] is almost the same as is discussed here by the Catholics on one hand, and by the partisans of schism on the other ; but as the latter will not yield to the authority of the Holy Church, but, on the contrary, contumaciously persist in enslaving the Spouse of Christ, contemning her most sacred disciplinar laws, &c., it is necessary to persist in the glorious endeavour to beat back schism. Much should I wish to apply the deplorable state in which Portugal is placed, to that into which Brazil is in danger of falling through the determined obstinacy and notes of our Strangfords, who respect the Vicar of Jesus Christ as they do the Grand Turk ;—but I must leave this Turk to the prudent and enlightened reader."

We beg the reader's attention to the expressions in this extract which treat the conduct of the Brazilian ministers as an attack on the independence of the Church ; because, while at variance with some vulgar ideas, they place the dispute in its proper light. It is not uncommon to consider the subjection of the Catholic Church, as established in different nations, to the Supreme Pontiff, as a certain degree of restraint and slavery. It is, in fact, the only true security for its independence. It has seldom been in free governments that so much jealousy has been felt of the close connection of the hierarchy with Rome. Perhaps the countries which allow this to the greatest extent are the United States, the British Empire, Belgium, and South America. On the other hand, Austria, Spain, and some petty states of Italy, not to speak of Protestant, or other absolute monarchies, have for years exhibited great jealousy of Roman interference ; and if the Church in France, in spite of the free institutions of the country, finds itself hampered and trammelled by the civil power, she has to thank the Bourbons, who so generously asserted the privileges of the Gallican Church, that she might be more completely under the sway and pressure of the civil power. But by having the supreme control in ecclesiastical affairs in the hands of a foreign, spiritual authority, who can wield it without fear of those who look more to political than to religious interests in their appoint-

ments, the Church can never completely become the slave or tool of the temporal rulers. The Brazilian public, and its organ the press, have taken this view of the matter; and their attachment to liberty has made them just and impartial in its distribution. They wish the Church to be independent of the political party that happens to govern the state; and they feel that only the independence of the Papal voice in approving or rejecting its nominees, can effect this great object. On the other hand, we have constant complaints from the High Church Protestants of improper promotions to the bench, and of Socinianism itself having been enthroned upon it. The crown nominates and issues its commands to the primate to consecrate, who being himself but a subject, has no power to resist. He gives institution, therefore, to a person whom he considers disqualified for the high office of a bishop. Were he co-ordinate with the nominating power, he might refuse.* The case of Rio Janeiro is not a solitary one even in this pontificate. The present Pope refused canonical institution in France to the Abbé Guillon for having held communion *in divinis* with Grégoire, though named by the King of the French to the see of Beauvais, in 1831. The king was consequently obliged to name another; and M. Guillon having given satisfaction to the Holy See, was created bishop *in partibus*. The same Pontiff has refused to confirm the nomination of some Polish bishop made by the Russian Autocrat. His predecessor, Leo XII, denied institution to a nobleman named by the Grand Duke of Tuscany to the see of Massa and Populonia, he having been found at his examination deficient in requisite learning.† He likewise refused to sanction the nomination of Don Fr. Nicolao de Almeida to a Portuguese bishopric, in consequence of errors contained in a work which he had published. In every instance, and in many more during the pontificates of Pius VI and Pius VII, the civil power gave way, and named unobjectionable candidates. In the case of Brazil, where the rulers were not disposed to yield, the popular voice interfered, and insisted upon

* The reader will find grievous complaints against the dangers and mischiefs of the present system of nomination to bishoprics in the Anglican Church, by looking at the *Church of England Quarterly Review* for January of this year, No. V, pp. 116, seqq. where the Church is energetically summoned to assert its rights, and *clamour* (p. 118, note) for the repeal of the *præmunire* which impends over the head of any bishop refusing to consecrate the nominee of the crown, *i. e.* of its minister. The writer, however, throws himself into one needless alarm,—to wit, that the ministry might choose a Catholic, and, of course, oblige the archbishop to consecrate him under pain of imprisonment and loss of chattels. We should like to know what Catholic would consent to receive consecration at his Grace's hands.

† All the bishops nominated in Italy and the adjacent islands are examined at Rome in theology and canon law, by a board of cardinals and divines appointed for that purpose.

the preservation of ecclesiastical liberty. Farther extracts from papers now before us will satisfactorily prove this.

The *Diario do Rio de Janeiro* for May 31, 1837, writes as follows:—"In this paper we have several times treated of the question regarding the bulls of the bishop nominated for Rio de Janeiro, and always so as to show that his Holiness was in the right. This truth, which we once maintained in spite of many prejudices to the contrary, has now convinced every intelligent mind: the parliamentary tribune, the periodical press, and powerful writings of an apologetic character, have happily combined to proclaim it, being in unison with the voice of the people, so ennobled in the old adage, '*Vox populi vox Dei.*' What remains is, that the illustrious patriot now at the head of judicial and foreign affairs, of whom we have always held the highest opinion, will at once put an end to this unfortunate question, in such manner as to merit the blessings of all good men in his country, whose consciences have for a long time been kept in a state of distress and agitation." The paper then recommends the "*Impartial Reflections*, giving a very full analysis of the work.

The *Jornal dos Debates* of May 20, 1837, writes as follows:—"The re-appearance of Sr. Manoel Alves Branco in the ministry, while yet are pending the negotiations with the court of Rome, wherein he most grievously compromised the dignity of the Brazilian name, appears to us a fact as impolitic as it is contrary to the interests of the nation. The note of September 23, 1835, addressed to the Holy See by Sr. Alves Branco, while secretary of foreign affairs, is a subject of eternal disgrace for the Brazilian government. . . . This note, in addition to being a wretched and ridiculous plagiarism, wounds, in an indecent and brutal manner, the dignity of the head of the universal Church, the venerable pastor of the Catholic flock." It then gives the two notes. In its number of May 31, it gives a long extract from the *Impartial Reflections*, approving its sentiments.

The *Semanario do Cincinnato*, a Rio weekly paper, devotes its leading article of June 3 to the same subject, under the head of "The Government and the Holy See." After some preliminary observations relative to the *Impartial Reflections*, the writer proceeds as follows: "We agree with the author of this work, that the government has displayed little prudence in treating this delicate affair.* It either recognizes the existence of a right in the Holy See to confirm bishops, or not. If the first, why does it

* We may note that the expression here used, is precisely the same as gave rise to a debate in the Senate, "*este milindroso negotio*:" here, certainly, it is not used contemptuously.

persist in requiring the Pope to act unfaithfully with his own conscience, and through fear of menaces, give a forced consent? If the second, why was the business at all submitted to the consideration of the Holy See?" The writer then states the arguments of the ministerial party. "No doubt," he continues, "Brazil likewise has the power to separate itself, as some desire, from the foundation-stone of the Church established by Christ; but this is not the question: the point is, whether that power be based upon justice, or only upon arbitrariness and violence. On justice, no,—most certainly; for the Church of Peter is the mother of all Christianity, as has been satisfactorily proved by great writers." The article proceeds to vindicate the absolute right of the Holy See to approve or reject all nominations to bishoprics, and then closes as follows. "We conclude by entreating the government to look at this business in its proper light, by its duty towards the Holy See, and the advantage to the nation, which desires to continue Roman Catholic. Let no one be so mistaken as to say that nothing will be gained by this. Putting aside the compliance with duty,—the peace of men's minds will be secured.* By a contrary course, most sensible evils will come. If the experiment would not be so fatal, we should tell them to try it, that they might be undeceived. But no. We desire to be always Roman Catholics."

To conclude these testimonials of the public press, the *Jornal do Commercio*, which we before quoted only as reporting the debates on the matter, in its paper of May 30, 1837, adds its suffrage to the general voice, and pronounces a warm and merited encomium upon the little work before us. It approves of all its views, and of the tone in which it is written, and concludes in these words. "Would to God, that the business to which it relates may at last be concluded to the mutual satisfaction of the Holy See and of Brazil. This is what all good men must certainly desire!"

The decided Catholic tone of so many organs of public opinion has, we acknowledge, delighted us. There is something generous in this vindication of an authority situated at several thousand miles distance, and having itself no means to repel on the spot the assaults made against it: nay there is something noble in seeing strong religious convictions thus impressed upon that class of

* Many readers will perhaps be surprised to learn that the writer sends ministers to this country to learn the mischiefs of a separation from Rome. We, on our parts, were glad to see this bold disclaimer of an opposite theory, and to find a newspaper acknowledging or supposing a higher standard of national happiness than industrial or financial prosperity.

publications which generally study to catch the light topics of ephemeral gossip, or to amuse its subscribers by trifling anecdote, rather than to engage their attention and interest for such grave and truly important topics.

Our readers will perhaps wish to know how far the public sense of right and justice, has triumphed, so far as effectually to bar the nomination made. To Dr. Moura's credit, it must be said, that when the quarrel was pushed so much beyond discretion by the ministry, he desired and proceeded to tender his resignation, and so cease to be an object of strife and discord between his country and the Holy See. But the government would not consent to accept this sensible offer, determined as it was to push the contest to extremities. A change of ministry having occurred, this offer was, we believe, acceded to. The objectionable nomination has therefore been withdrawn; although as yet the See of Rio de Janeiro remains vacant and under administration.

There are yet three works cited at the head of our article, which have not been referred to; and as we did not mean to place them there merely for display, we proceed very briefly to notice them. The title of No. 2, which we have given at length, will sufficiently explain our motive for joining it to the others. It is an echo of the sentiments of the Brazilian public from beyond the boundaries of its empire, and the reach of political jealousies or interests. To those acquainted with the biography of St. Catherine of Siena, the occasion of publishing an encomium of her virtues will not appear unsuitable to the object proposed in the title. That most extraordinary Saint, whose writings enter into the rank of classics in Italian literature, devoted herself at a tender age to the extirpation of schism, with wonderful success, and convinced Pope Gregory XI, that it was the divine will he should return from Avignon to Rome. The writer has therefore added an appendix to his sermon, of twenty-eight pages, in which he warmly insists upon the necessity of preserving ecclesiastical unity, through an unbroken communication with the apostolic See. In § 4, the author proceeds to treat of the conduct of the Brazilian Government; expresses his astonishment at the blindness of those that conducted it, and gives unqualified praise to the Archbishop of Bahia (the Primate,) to the Dean and Chapter of Rio, and to the apostolic delegate, all of whom have acted the part which the Church expected from them, in their respective capacities. The remaining portion of the appendix contains, in a similar strain, an earnest and learned vindication of ecclesiastical independence. We applaud the zeal, the learning, and the sound principles of the author.

The "Memoir upon the Right of Primacy" is a translation from the French of Monsig. Hirn, Bishop of Tournay, who distinguished himself on occasion of the memorable Council of Paris, convoked by Napoleon in 1811. This translation was most seasonably made and published: it was read with avidity, and produced a change in the sentiments of many, who before had weighed the matter less seriously. It is an additional proof of the interest which the public took in this religious discussion.

The last work which we have placed at the beginning of our article, is the eighth number of a religious journal carried on at Rio, and, though bearing a Latin title, written in Portuguese. We should have been glad to possess more numbers of the series, as it is impossible from one to form a correct judgment of its views or principles. However, when we see the greater portion of this taken up with the Encyclical of the present Pope to the Bishops of Switzerland in 1835, directed against the usurpations of the ecclesiastical rights by the civil legislature of several cantons, we cannot for a moment doubt that the spirit which presides over the compilation of the journal, is soundly Catholic. The rest of the number is taken up with an account of the missions of Paraguay, and religious selections in prose and verse, —some of the former from Challoner.

We have derived no small satisfaction from the perusal of these various works, and from the examination of the great practical questions to which they refer. They have led us to feel more than ever that the true basis of religion is in the hearts of the people, rather than in the heads of their rulers; and that, however useful and satisfactory it may be to see these respecting and publicly honouring the hierarchy, or lending it the moral weight of their avowed convictions and religious zeal, its holiest interests become endangered in proportion to the degree of actual interference which is allowed them in its affairs. Spain and Portugal are lamentable instances of this truth. The people remain unalterably fixed in their attachment to the ancient faith, while their rulers have conducted the one country into the gulf of schism, and the other to its verge. In spite of every prohibition, daily recourse is had to Rome from the clergy of Portugal, for faculties, where their own superiors being intruders, are not empowered to grant them; and from the laity for dispensations and privileges beyond the jurisdiction of local ecclesiastical authorities. In Spain, it is the same, though there, in fact, no breach has taken place with the Holy See. Within these few weeks, we have read with pleasure, that the municipal authorities of one of the principal Christino cities (Valentia) have put a stop to the labours of the Bible-and-tract-men, who were taking advantage

of the confusion to sow tares in the field of Christ. And the papers of that party applauded this decisive conduct of the magistracy, observing that, in the present disturbed state of Spain, religious dissension and warfare would indeed be the finishing blow of their country's misery. We have it from undoubted authority, that, during the last month, one commercial house alone paid into the Roman Dataria, in the course of ten days, 30,000 dollars, as fees in ecclesiastical affairs. The money and the business connected with it came from Madrid, with the full knowledge and consent of persons high in the Christino interest. And we have no doubt that, sooner or later, when the political troubles of the two countries cease, the Catholic religion and its holy Church will recover their proper influence, and the hearts of the people will rejoice to see peace of conscience and quietness of government once more restored.

There is something singular in reading the sincere lamentations uttered by almost all the writers we have reviewed, over the blindness of these their parent countries, and their sincere remonstrances with them at having allowed the bane of schismatical feeling to disgrace their political struggles. It is a solemn but a pleasing thing, to hear a voice from across the ocean teaching the duty of spiritual obedience to nations that stand almost under the shadow of Peter's throne; the voice of republics and of free constitutional monarchy (but lately considered outlaws and rebels), boldly reproving the Most Catholic and Most Faithful monarchies for swerving from fidelity to the Catholic Church. We hail its sound with joy, as one note in that grand accord which the unity of faith and the communion of love throughout the universal Church, raise on earth, the only meet symbol, as it is the echo, of the harmony of a sublime sphere !

MISCELLANEOUS INTELLIGENCE.

FRANCE.—Legacies of four sums, amounting in all to 17,000*fr.*, have been left to the order of Christian Doctrine, for the support of schools in four specified towns. The number of novices in the establishments of the order of Christian schools in France reaches 260. A subscription has been opened in Paris and other places to present to the Archbishop of Cologne a picture by M. Hauser, representing our Saviour explaining the allegory of the vine to his disciples.

The Abbé Dupuch has lately established at Bourdeaux several charitable institutions for poor children, amongst which are a house in which the poor Savoyards, who annually come to Bourdeaux in great numbers, are lodged and receive religious instruction; thirty infant schools, containing in all 1800 children, under the age of thirteen, after which they are apprenticed to different virtuous tradesmen; gratuitous elementary schools, under the direction of the sisters of the Presentation of the Blessed Virgin, who take charge of five hundred girls, besides a normal school for schoolmistresses; two establishments for orphan boys and one for girls. His principal establishment is a house of confinement for young prisoners, founded in March 1837: in September it contained fifty prisoners, divided into five classes or stages of punishment, with their respective superintendent. They are obliged to keep silence, and are taught to read and write; they choose their own trade and receive elementary instruction in it from regular masters; they love one another, and are above everything eager for religious instruction. M. Dupuch has been appointed its director, with the approbation, and at the express request of the Inspector General of the French prisons, who intends to form institutions on the same plan in other parts of France.

The civil and ecclesiastical authorities of Lyons have recognized and opened the Faculty of Theology in that city. Several professors of great merit have been appointed; the course was opened in an elegant discourse on the propagation and influence of Christianity, by M. Pavy, professor of ecclesiastical history.

BELGIUM.—The number of religious institutions in Belgium is daily increasing. The bishops and clergy have been most zealous in founding seminaries and places of education; under their united patronage, but particularly through the zeal of the late Prince de Méan, Bishop of Mechlin, and his successor, the Catholic University of Louvain has become the resort of students from other countries, as well as from the neighbouring provinces. The list of students in the year 1837 included 350 names; that of the present year reaches to 410. It is not to be supposed that the present University can ever possess revenues equal to those of the old University of Louvain, which were valued at 1,400,000*fr.*; but by the zeal and activity of the bishops, another college has been lately opened for the reception of medical students. The object of these colleges (*pédagogies*) is to provide against the dangers to which the students would be exposed by living in the city, and to enable them to

pursue their studies with less interruption and distraction. There are thirty-five medical students in the new establishment, in the Faculty of Theology are upwards of forty, ten of whom are foreigners; that of Philosophy contains about two hundred. The extensive chemical laboratory is nearly finished. The authorities of Louvain have entrusted the reorganization of their municipal school to the professors of the University. The course of Theology for the present year is as follows; the *Psalms, Proverbs, Ecclesiastes; Oriental Languages*, by M. Beelen; *Ecclesiastical History*, by M. Wouters; *Canon Law*, by M. de Ram, Rector of the University; *The third Book of the Decretals*, by M. Verhoeven; *The treatise on the most blessed Trinity*, by M. Malon; on the *Sacraments of Orders and Matrimony*, by M. Verkest. By the official returns it appears that there are in all three hundred and twenty-nine religious communities of men and women in Belgium; one hundred and fifteen of them are for the care of the sick or of lunatics; one hundred and thirty-eight are houses of education; seventy-six are for the reception of those who devote themselves to a contemplative life. These last contain the smallest number of inmates; their members are bound by vows of poverty, and the greater portion of them subsist wholly on alms. These seventy-six houses are divided into twenty-four religious communities of men, and fifty-two of women. Amongst the former are Recollects, Capuchins, Dominicans, Augustinians, Urbanists, and Trappists; the last-mentioned spend part of their time, like their brethren in England and Ireland, in tilling the ground; amongst the latter are convents belonging to nearly every order approved by the Church. Of these the most remarkable are the Béguines. Their establishments (*béguinages*) which exist nowhere but in Belgium, form streets, and even entire parishes, of small irregularly built houses, which the traveller at first would suppose to be wholly tenantless and deserted. On each door is inscribed the name of the saint whom the solitary inmate has chosen for her protector. They make vows of chastity and obedience, which are obligatory only during the time they belong to the order. They spend their time in religious exercises or in working, and whatever they gain by their labours is their individual property, of which they are not bound to render any account. The houses are usually built, either by the more opulent Béguines, or with the funds left to the order. When one of the number dies, another is appointed to succeed to her house, for which she pays, on admission, a sum determined by the condition of the building and its furniture. This money is reserved for repairs of the *béguinage*, and the expenses of the infirmary, which, with a church and curate, always forms a part of it. The Capuchins, Recollects, Trappists, and barefooted Carmelites, wear the habits of their order, in public. Besides the Dominicans, Redemptorists, and monks of Citeaux, the Society of Jesus have houses at Brussels and Antwerp, and colleges at Namur, Brugellete, Alost, and Ghent. The Prémontrés have taken possession of their venerable abbeys at Afflinghem, Grimberge, and Everbode. From the returns it may be also gathered that the progress of religion has been greater in the northern than in the southern provinces of the kingdom. The perpetual adoration of the blessed Sacrament, and the devotion of

the month of Mary (May) have been attended with the most successful results; and the Redemptorists, the Society of Jesus, and other missionaries, have given retreats in different places, to which immense crowds of people flocked to attend the sermons, and join in the other exercises of piety. Since 1830, in the diocese of Bruges alone, sixteen new churches or chapels have been built; fifteen have been repaired, increased, or are now undergoing repairs; and on these works 356,500*fr.* are to be expended. M. Louis Vuylsteke, who is no less celebrated for his piety than his talents, gratuitously spends the whole of his leisure time in drawing plans for churches, schools, convents, &c.; he has built upwards of thirty churches or chapels.

AUSTRIAN DOMINIONS.—The Empress of Austria, in her recent pilgrimage to the celebrated chapel of St. Mary, at Maziagell, made an offering of a rich necklace of pearl, fastened with a clasp formed of the ball fired by an assassin at her august husband in 1832. The ball is cased with gold and diamonds.

On the 18th of October the emperor laid the first stone of the convent which is about to be built by the Mechitarists in Vienna. The pope's nuncio officiated and blessed the work. It is mentioned in the French papers that two Mechitarist Fathers arrived from Venice at Paris in January, on their way to England, where a rich Armenian Catholic has invited them to found an establishment of their order. Their society at Vienna for the publication of good books has circulated during the last seven years 260,166 volumes. In 1836, 26,464 were distributed in Austria, Bavaria, and the rest of Germany, including 3000 volumes in the diocese of Cologne, and 900 in that of Munster.

M. Albertini, an ecclesiastic of Verona, bequeathed a sum of 100,000 florins to establish a house for the Society of Jesus at Verona. The bishop of the city exerted himself to obtain the consent of the government to this foundation; it has been granted, and the fathers have taken possession of their house. The inhabitants of Inspruck had long desired to give up the care of their hospital to the Sisters of St. Vincent of Paul. Their petition to the emperor has been favourably received, and a collection made for them by the curate has produced 25,000 florins. The expenses incurred in building the noble cathedral of Erlau, mentioned in our fifth number, amount to 800,000 florins, a great part of which has been subscribed by the Archbishop Pyrker, Patriarch of Venice.

BAVARIA.—The royal chapel of All Saints at Munich, one of the finest works of the present king, was opened on the 29th of October, by Mgr. Gebattel, Archbishop of Munich. The paintings by Hess are universally admired.

The following sums have been given in the years, and for the purposes specified, by members of the clergy alone in Bavaria; In 1830, 10,850 florins for hospitals and primary schools, by two canons of Munich and Wurtzburg and a country curate; in 1831, 4,300 florins for education in his parish, by the curate Emiller; in the same year, the dean of the chapter of Munich bequeathed a house and landed property to the Lyceum of Freisingen; in 1833, 10,200 florins for education, by two ecclesiastics; in 1834, 4,100 florins for education; in 1835, for

education 43,000 florins ; in 1836, 1,000 florins for a hospital ; M. Seidl, curate of Tolz, made the schools and poor of his parish sole heirs of his fortune, 15,950 florins. These sums amount to 89,810 florins. In this sum are not included other legacies not mentioned by the official paper from which the above are copied ; we must not, however, omit a sum of 40,000 florins left by two curates of Bamberg.

The king of Bavaria has presented to the English nuns of the Institute of the Blessed Virgin the ancient abbey of Niedernbourg at Passau. They were received with the sincerest expressions of joy and welcome by the inhabitants. On the 30th of September, Mgr. Riccabona, bishop of the city, installed the new superioress ; and on the following day three novices made their vows in his presence.

SAXONY.—Numerous conversions have taken place within the last four months, and other Protestants are on the point of embracing the Catholic religion. The conversion of M. Bergmann, a student in Theology, has created a deep impression amongst the members of his former communion. At Halle, M. Ringmann has lately made his profession of the Catholic faith, and his example will probably be followed by several of his fellow-students.

ELECTORAL HESSE.—A subscription was opened in 1829 to raise a monument at Fulda to St. Boniface, the Apostle of Germany, whose tomb is in the cathedral of that city. Different causes, especially the destruction by fire of the foundry of Cassel, have until now prevented the execution of this design ; but a fresh agreement has been made, fixing the 1st of August of the present year, as the day for the completion of the statue of the saint in bronze. A central convent of Sisters of Charity for the principality of Hesse, has been formed in his episcopal city by Mgr. Pfaff, bishop of Fulda. The funds for this purpose have been partly supplied by the bishop from his own moderate revenues, and partly by a sum of 1,000*fr.*, sent by the Duchess of Orleans to the sisters of this city, where she was met by the envoy of the King of the French, on her way to Paris.

SCHWARTZENBURG.—A church has long been wanted in Arnstadt, and it has only been within the last year that the Catholics have found means to perform the duties of their religion in a becoming edifice. For this, they are indebted to a legacy of 550 crowns left by the pious Mr. Hamilton, professor and ex-prior of the Scotch monks at Erfurt, the subscriptions made by the Catholics of Fulda, Leipzig, and the kingdom of Bavaria, but chiefly to the generosity of Louis, king of Bavaria. The dedication was performed on the 11th of September last by M. Liebber, curate of Erfurt, Gotha and Arnstadt. On the 11th of October, the Catholics were again met in their church by the civil authorities, who presented to them, in the name of their sovereign, a superb ostensorium, which had been sent for expressly to Stuttgard, accompanied by the following letter addressed to the Catholic inhabitants of Arnstadt :—

“ You have been until now deprived of the advantage of possessing an edifice in which you could duly nourish your piety, and worthily celebrate the worship of God. This religious want has just been supplied. In the accomplishment of so lawful a desire, which you have felt for

many years, and which has been met even by strangers with manifold sympathy and charity, we have thought it our duty to join in a particular manner, especially as we have been convinced by reading the book of hymns composed for the dedication, and of which you have forwarded to us a copy, of that lively and sincere piety, of those Christian feelings, and of that attachment to our person, with which the whole assembly was filled. To contribute, as much as in us lies, to preserve and keep alive for the time to come, these beautiful feelings, we have not been able to refuse ourselves the gratification of offering to you, with the accompanying ostensorium, a proof of our paternal affection, and, in some measure, an earnest of the justice and protection that you will always find in us towards every thing that concerns religion as well as your temporal interests.

GOUTHIER-FRED. CHARLES."

"*Sondershausen, 7th Oct. 1837.*

SWITZERLAND.—The government of the Ticino has employed all its resources for the laudable purpose of improving their province, by rendering the passage over Mount St. Gothard safe and convenient. To provide for the spiritual as well as the corporal wants of travellers, the Capuchin fathers of the canton have been applied to, and have engaged to keep in the hospital of Mount St. Gothard two religious, with a lay-brother of their order, to assist any one in danger, to furnish provisions to indigent travellers, to celebrate mass at a convenient hour every day, to administer the sacraments to the neighbouring inhabitants, and to instruct them in the great truths of religion.

The first annual report of the college founded last year at Schwytz, and placed under the care of the Society of Jesus, has appeared. The subscriptions received from every part of Christendom for its support amount to 80,000 livres of Swiss money. Amongst the founders are his Holiness, the king of Sardinia, the grand-duke of Modena, and the duke of Blacas. Father Drach, formerly of the College of Friburg, is the superior. It is intended to form funds for pensioners, and the plan is expected to succeed as well as at Friburg. Rumour adds, that the school of the Society at Bourg is to be discontinued, on account of the fewness of the students, and because the king of Bavaria has applied to the Society to send some of its members into his dominions.

GREECE.—A letter from the bishop of Syra gives the following information respecting the state of religion in the kingdom of Greece. The number of Catholics is very small—they are to be found only at Athens, Poros, Nauplia, Patras, and Navarino. His lordship has the spiritual government of the Catholics in these places. Besides continental Greece, there are four islands with their several bishops, Naxia, Syra, Tino, and Santorino. It is thought that the total number of Catholics in Greece is about 15,000. It is painful to add, that the Catholics do not enjoy the same freedom in the exercise of their religion under Otho of Bavaria, as they possessed under the dominion of the Turks. Their only protection exists in the rights reserved to itself by the French government, in the protocols with the court of St. James', in which it is provided that no one shall interfere with the bishoprics and missions which have been from time immemorial under the protection of France.

TURKEY.—On the very day that his Holiness pronounced his allocution respecting the affairs of Cologne before the sacred college, consoling intelligence reached Rome from Constantinople. The Armenian Catholics had always been unsuccessful in their petitions to be distinguished from their schismatical countrymen. All the civil acts regarding them could acquire a legal force solely by means of the schismatical patriarch, and it may be easily conceived to what annoyances they were consequently exposed. In 1830, indeed, the Sultan acknowledged them as a Catholic nation; but they could only obtain leave to build one church, as the minister, Pêrtel Pacha, who had been gained over by the schismatics, found means to render all their applications fruitless. The English papers have already mentioned the disgrace and banishment of the minister; his successor has procured a firman authorising the Armenian Catholics to build nineteen churches,—three in Constantinople, and the rest in other cities of the empire.

SWEDEN.—M. Studach, vicar-apostolic in Sweden, having collected amongst his Catholic brethren in England, France, and Belgium, a sum sufficient to build a church in Stockholm, it was opened on the 16th of September. The following extracts are from a letter dated Stockholm, 4th December:—

“ I have great satisfaction in announcing to you that the new Catholic church, the first built for three centuries, has been consecrated. Its architecture is simple, but majestic, and worthy of the house of God. Thanks be to God and our benefactors, all is paid for! For what yet remains, we live in the most sanguine hope. The consecration took place at nine A.M. on the 16th of September. High mass was sung at eleven o'clock. Besides the queen and their royal highnesses the prince and princess-royal, there were present the governor and some of the other authorities. The Lutherans and Jews who have contributed to the building were also present. A mass of Nasselinger's was executed by forty-two musicians. After the gospel, M. Studach ascended the pulpit and delivered a discourse in the Swedish language. This sermon offended none, and drew tears from all. The celebration of the holy sacrifice made a salutary impression on all the spectators, many of whom had never seen a Catholic church. In a word, every thing comforts us with the prospect that our temporal church will soon obtain for us a spiritual one.”

After mass, an affecting scene took place in the sacristy. A subscription had been opened and amounted to 2,764 francs. The interest of this sum is to form a revenue for the poor, bearing the name of M. Studach. The address of the senior syndic on presenting it to him, is too full of affection and gratitude to be omitted:—

“ In less than four years, you have founded for this parish the beautiful church which you have this day consecrated, an abode for priests and for orphans, and you have taught the catechism in the language of the country. Every one can readily perceive that great exertions have been necessary to accomplish all this. Moreover, continual anxiety and toil, nights which have passed without bringing you sleep and rest, have so weakened your health, that more than once you have been on the point

of sinking. Your flock desires to express to you its deep-felt gratitude. Beloved father ! how can we give expression to the feelings of wonder and gratitude with which we are filled ? All that you have done for us, the lessons that you have given us in the temple, the example that you have given by your pure and stainless conduct, are written on our hearts in ineffaceable characters. We thank you, beloved father, by our feelings. Your name shall be held in benediction amongst our remotest descendants. May the Most High allow us to possess you for many years ! May you announce to us for a long, very long time, the truths of the Word of God in the temple which you have built, that you may have the satisfaction to see some at least of the fruits of your great work ! To love you, to respect you, we shall always be able ; to reward you can only be in the power of the Almighty who sent you amongst us. As a mark of the respect which is felt by your flock towards its noble and beloved pastor, and as the only mark of gratitude that can be of any value in your eyes, the parish has established, on this day of its being born again after so many centuries, a fund, the interest of which will serve to relieve the poor belonging to it. The parishioners unanimously request that this fund may bear the name of their greatest benefactor—STUDACH."

PRUSSIAN POLAND.—The *Theological Annals*, published at Posen, supply us with the following facts illustrative of the system of indirect persecution, to which we have already referred, practised by the Prussian government towards the Catholic subjects in its possessions in Poland. This journal is published in the language of Poland, and is conducted in a firm and temperate spirit. Its editor, M. Jabczynski, is an ecclesiastic of great virtue and ability, and the proprietors concur, with laudable zeal, in endeavouring to awaken a spirit of energy and application in the rising generation, and particularly endeavour to encourage the study of theology amongst the clergy. The Prussian provinces in Poland form three extensive dioceses, -- Posen, with the archbishopric of Gnezen (Gniezno) attached to it, Culm, and Ermland (Warmia). To these Breslau might be added ; as ever since these provinces have been part of Prussia, it has always been suffragan to Gnezen, and its population is wholly Polish. The number of inhabitants in each of these dioceses is not less than a million, all of whom are Catholics. Notwithstanding their national character, which is as distinctly marked as their attachment to the Catholic Church, the King of Prussia is attempting to *Germanise* them, by undermining their religion. A system of skilfully adapted measures is regularly followed by his government for this purpose. All the ecclesiastical dignitaries, all the persons whose station gives them any influence amongst the clergy, and in some places all the parochial clergy, are Germans. Their ignorance of the language of their flocks, forms no exception to the general rule followed in their selection. Thus the Bishop of Ermland, Mgr. Hohenzollern-Heichingen, whose elevation has recently taken place, is a Prussian who does not understand the Polish language. His clergy is not a national body ; the government, which has gradually destroyed the religious orders, forbids natives to be raised to the priesthood. Two evils have hence arisen ; the ancient clergy are rapidly disappearing, and the want of priests is gene-

rally felt; and to fill up this deficiency, the bishops have applied to the clergy of Breslau, where the Polish language is still spoken. Breslau, however, is completely a Prussian diocese; the clergy have no schools of their own, and the young ecclesiastics are obliged to have recourse to the universities, which are full of rationalism and impiety, and where there is no distinction between them and the secular students. The other dioceses are similarly situated. Culm is in a condition still more lamentable. The law forbidding the ordination of natives is in force; the ecclesiastical schools have been suppressed, and the convents shut up; most of the churches are without priests. This state of things has been loudly condemned by the press, in spite of the rigid censorship exercised over it. Other facts are still more plain and more convincing. Thus, at Oliva, near Dantzic, there was an extensive community of Benedictines, of the order of Cîteaux, whose monastery, founded in the time of Saint Bernard, was the admiration of all Poland. The Prussian government forbade the monks to receive novices, and the inmates were soon considerably reduced in number. Their suppression shortly followed; the religious being dead, and the convent destroyed, their church was given to the parish of Oliva, whose former church was put into the hands of the evangelical congregation of the town. The king had previously "*most graciously*" we quote from the royal proclamation, "*condescended to relieve the priests of the mission (the Lazarists) from their labours in the direction of the seminary*" of the above town. In their places, four ecclesiastics, all foreigners, have been appointed. Their conduct, and that of their director, has made the loss of the Lazarists more deeply felt. Besides their foreign extraction, their life and behaviour have neither been virtuous nor irreproachable. The generous labours of the Lazarists endeared them to the inhabitants of Posen, Vilna, Minsk, and Bialystok, where they are established, and afford edification and comfort to the Catholics of Poland. This change at Posen did not satisfy the government; a second seminary has been founded in the same diocese, and placed under superiors "*of the right sort.*" Of the professors one only is a priest, the others are all laymen. But it was foreseen that this seminary would soon be deserted by the Catholics of the country; and to prevent such an open failure in its plans from becoming public, the government founded rich scholarships, which have enticed many German students to the establishment. Ecclesiastical advancement is readily obtained by these strangers, though it is in a great measure refused to the Catholic natives. It is consoling to reflect that there are still remaining many virtuous and excellent ecclesiastics. The faith, morals, and virtue of the inhabitants, are not yet destroyed. Many facts attest the zeal of some of the clergy, and especially of the primate.

The sequel to this account of the persecution of the Catholics has just reached us. The concluding sentence of the preceding paragraph alludes to the zeal of the Archbishop of Posen in defence of the Church. As far back as the 28th of last October, before the arrest of the Archbishop of Cologne, or the delivery of the Pope's allocution, this intrepid and virtuous bishop had addressed to the king an earnest expostulation on the regulations for mixed marriages, prescribed by him to the Catholic

clergy. When those events had taken place, he wrote a circular letter for the use of his clergy, explaining in the clearest terms the doctrine of the Church on the question of marriages; and forbade, on pain of suspension, to be incurred *ipso facto*, any of his clergy to act contrary to it. Soon after the appearance of this pastoral, the Archbishop and three of his chapter were arrested; but the matter was conducted with so much dispatch and secrecy, that the place of their confinement could not be discovered.

RUSSIA.—We here extract an account of the state of religion in Russia, copied from a Belgian paper, which professes to have received it from authentic sources. The same documents have been open to a French paper, which fully confirms the statements of the former.

“The Emperor Alexander solemnly promised, in the edict for suppressing the Society of Jesus, that their property should remain in the hands of the Catholics. This promise has been eluded, their property has been seized and their churches given to the schismatics, who had previously more churches than they required, whilst the Catholics were in want of them. The town of Vitebsk contains 20,000 souls. This number is frequently much augmented by the nobles and public officers, who come to it for the affairs of the province of which it is the chief town. There is, however, only one church; and a petition to the emperor for another has not been successful. The Jews, Turks, and even idolators, are allowed to establish their places of worship in Russia: while the Catholics are often deprived of theirs, which are too few for their wants. The emperor has forbidden them to raise new churches, or repair the old ones, without his permission, which, when sought, is delayed till the churches have fallen to ruins. The number of parishes is likewise too small; persons are often a whole day’s journey distant from their parish church; and this, added to the fewness of priests, renders the administration of the sacraments almost impossible. To increase this evil, the bishops have been commanded not to nominate any chaplain or parish priest without the previous permission of the local governor, to obtain which is extremely difficult; and thus an entrance is made, not for the true shepherd, but for wolves to devour the flock. This want of priests has been rendered still greater by an imperial edict forbidding any communication between the clergy of the Catholic and of the united-Greek Church. In one part of Russia, all the nobles follow the Latin rite, while the lower classes belong to the united-Greek Church. The scarcity of priests, the distance from their own churches, and other circumstances, allowed a dispensation in many cases from the law which requires the members of each rite to receive the sacraments and attend mass at the church of his own rite. But the imperial edict, by preventing any communication between the members of the two rites, has deprived the faithful in many places of the comforts of religion. The nobles assembled at Mohilow, and addressed a petition to the emperor for more priests, and received for answer that the number of priests was sufficient for the number of Catholics.

“The religious orders have been gradually suppressed. In 1829, an edict was published, requiring all candidates for entering any religious

order, to obtain the previous permission of the governor of the province, to see whom a journey of several days is often necessary : to him they were to show their letters of nobility, and then to wait for the approval of the Minister of Public Worship. We need not add, that since 1829, few of the candidates have received a favourable answer to their petition. These measures soon left the convents nearly empty, and the emperor then issued an edict for suppressing them, *on account of the small number of their inmates*. When public report anticipated the appearance of this edict, the nobles prepared a petition in favour of the monasteries, but the government hastened its publication, and instantly suppressed the monasteries, and closed the churches and schools attached to them. Free education is also forbidden. The Catholic priests are not allowed to answer the objections and calumnies industriously circulated against their faith, or to teach that salvation is attainable only in their Church. Books treating of the articles of faith on which the Churches differ, can neither be imported nor printed in Russia. These points are likewise excluded from the courses of theology permitted by government in the seminaries ; and all mention of the procession of the Holy Ghost and of the supremacy of the Pope, is strictly interdicted.

In this persecution, Poland has not escaped. In 1833, the supreme government of Warsaw issued an edict commanding the Bishop of Podlachia, Monsig. Gutkowski, to take out of all libraries a book *on the concord and discord* of the Greeks and Latins. The bishop answered, that obedience to this decree was forbidden by his duty, and the religion of which he was the guardian. The same prelate sent a remarkable answer to a letter written by General Golowin, respecting marriages between Greeks and Latins. The Poles were surprised at the new doctrines advanced by the general ; but it was well known that in Russia an edict had long been enforced, by which, when one of the parties belonged to the Greek Church, all the children were to be educated in that communion. On this occasion, even the children born before the publication of the edict, were forced to abjure the Catholic faith ; the prisons of Volhinia were filled, in 1833, with these unfortunate children. In Poland, the nobles alone remain faithful to the Church, and against them this edict was framed ; the lower classes were already sufficiently pliant. The education given to the children of the nobility tends to the same object. Their schools have been taken from the religious orders, and given to laymen ; the scholars are obliged to learn the sciences in the Russian language, of which they are ignorant ; the masters have been formed in schismatical universities, and are generally themselves schismatics ; they know well that the surest way to promotion is by seducing their scholars to the creed of their rulers. The young men who choose the profession of arms, are all placed under schismatical professors. Means are taken to corrupt the clergy ; they are tempted by the prospect of wealth, honours, and advancement, or ground down by injustice and persecution. The excellent Szezyt, administrator of the diocese of Mohilow, who opposed the suppression of the monasteries, was, under pretence of being entrusted with a commission from government, removed to the extremities of the empire, and could only obtain

leave to return to his flock by the intercession of the nobility. The only bishop of the united Greek Church who has withstood all the seduction and menaces of the government, is Monsignor Bulhak, whose advanced age will not allow him long to stand in their way.

The order of St. Basil was renowned for the zeal, learning, and virtues of the members whom it furnished to the secular clergy; and no priest could be raised to the episcopacy unless he had belonged to it. This law has been annulled, the order has been subjected to the secular clergy, its provincials are appointed by the bishops, and its monks are not allowed to hold communion in things divine with the Latin clergy. Their studies are distinct, and suspected authors are put into their hands. They cannot receive any novices except such as are the children of parents belonging to the united-Greek Church. Many of their monasteries have been suppressed, and their property has been assigned to the secular clergy, for the purpose of gaining them over to the views of government. It is to be regretted that several of the higher clergy appear to have declared their willingness to join the schismatical Greek Church; and it is certain that some of them have ordered those under their direction, to use missals printed at Moscow, from which the procession of the Holy Ghost and the supremacy of the Pope, are omitted. The inferior clergy have not been so submissive to the wishes of the government. Fifty-four of them declared in writing that they could not in conscience use such missals. This remonstrance irritated their bishop; some of them yielded to his threats; and the others were condemned to a year's penance in a monastery, and obliged to undergo an examination before their faculties were restored to them. The author from whose work the subject of their examination was to be selected, was the one introduced by government into the schools of the united-Greek Catholics. At the end of the year, one of the imprisoned priests, M. Plawki, a man distinguished for his piety and learning, instead of submitting to the examination, wrote a severe critical refutation of the book in question. His refutation was sent to St. Petersburg, and he was immediately sent into exile with his six children, and all his property was sold. He is now dying of want and privation in the place of his banishment. The persecutions practised on the lower classes are still more cruel and tyrannical. In some cases, exemption from public duties is promised to those who unite with the schismatics. If this deceit does not succeed, a few of the most abandoned inhabitants of the parish are induced to sign a petition in the name of the whole parish, expressing its desire to embrace the state religion. The church is immediately filled with troops, the inhabitants are assembled and informed that their request has been graciously approved, and that they are allowed to follow the religion of their choice. If any one dares to raise his voice against such a proceeding, and assert that it has happened without his knowledge and against his wishes, he is seized and cruelly flogged for leaving, as it is pretended, the religion which he had just embraced. It is then notified to the authorities that the parish has adopted the state-creed, and Catholic priests are forbidden to administer the sacraments in it. If the first attempt fails, the government agents return again and again to the attack. Thus the tenants on

an estate, formerly belonging to the Jesuits, at Polotsk, have one by one been forced to abandon the creed of their forefathers. These persecutions induced the nobles assembled at Vitebsk to address a remonstrance to the emperor against forcing any one to apostatize from his religion : it was signed by all present, Catholics, Protestants, and schismatics, with one exception. Early intelligence of this public protest was conveyed to the emperor, who immediately issued an order to the nobles not to enter into any religious questions in their address. The parish of Us-gacz, (district of Lepel) presented a petition complaining of the violent measures used to make them change their religion. 'We have been threatened,' they say, 'we have been beaten, our hair has been plucked out, our teeth broken, and we have been cast into prison.' But they were ready to undergo every thing rather than deny their faith. The same complaints were addressed to the emperor by the inhabitants of another village. Orders have now been given, that in future such remonstrances are not to be received. The only instances of favour towards the Catholics which we find mentioned, are that, on his visit to Cronstadt in 1836, the emperor granted 200,000 rubles from the treasury, for building a Catholic church, and house for the clergy, in that town. The work is now begun : the first stone was laid by Monsignor Ignatius Paulowski, President of the Catholic College. Funds have been allowed to other churches in different places ; and the government has lent 500,000 rubles without interest, for four years, to the Catholic church of St. Catherine at St. Petersburg.

UNITED STATES.—A short account of the proceedings of the Council of Baltimore, held in April last year, is contained in an extract from a letter written by Monsignor Bruté, bishop of Vincennes, to a friend in Europe :—

"I intended some time ago to send you an account of our progress in these parts, but I waited, in the hope that our Lord would be pleased still more to increase and continue the graces and fruits of our new mission. At my arrival in my diocese in November 1834, the total of my clergy amounted to *two* priests, but the Almanack of this year will contain *twenty-one*, and we have small parishes begun in every direction ; *small*, when we consider their number, but great when we look to their distance from each other ; the manner in which they are scattered over tracts of country, any of them being equal to a French diocese, or two or three Italian ones. I have just finished a journey of between six and seven hundred miles on horseback, from Vincennes to Souttebeud, near the frontiers of Michigan, thence to Fortwayne, thence to Logansport, and lastly, to Terre Haute ; to give confirmation to the few who happened to be prepared to receive it. There were, however, above sixty of them, and above sixty communicants in their wood-built church, which is sixty feet in length and forty in breadth. In other places, the number of persons to be confirmed was small ; in one parish, no more than seven were prepared. It is true, that on account of the Council of Baltimore, and the time of my return being uncertain, timely notice could not be sent to these worthy ecclesiastics. The council has petitioned his Holiness to establish three new dioceses ; Natchez for the state of Mississippi,

Nashville for Tennessee, and Dubuque for the country to the north of St. Louis. *Ostium magnum apertum ! Messis multa !* Consider, that 266,495 emigrants have landed in the Port of New York alone within the last six years. Alas ! alas ! would that there had been priests in proportion ! *Rogate, rogate Dominum messis.* Advance and encourage by every means in your power the missions of the United States, the most important of all ; now is the *crisis*, after which they are to rise or fall ; a second Europe is to be converted, the Church to be planted *nunc vel nunquam*. I am summoned elsewhere ; pray for

“ SIMON BRUTÉ, bishop of Vincennes.

“ *Washington (Indiana) 21st July, 1837.*”

Missouri.—This mission has suffered an irreparable loss by the death of the Rev. Father Quickenborne, S. J. He was born near Ghent in 1788 ; he entered the Society of Jesus in 1814, and was sent to America in 1817. His success in converting the Osages, and forming that infant mission, induced Monsignor Dubourg, the bishop of Louisiana, to entrust the whole district of the Missouri to him. He established the order of the Sacred Heart at St. Louis and St. Charles, where he likewise built a beautiful church of stone. He was the founder of the Catholic University of St. Louis, which, at present, contains forty-three members of the society. During the month of August, he fell sick on his way to visit a newly-converted parish ; and, on his arrival at Portage, he was obliged to confine himself to his bed. In the middle of the night, word was brought him, that one of the flock was at the point of death. As no other priest was at hand, the heroic missionary caused himself to be conveyed to the sick man's bed-side, heard his confession, and administered the sacrament of extreme unction. When conveyed home, he found that his end was approaching ; all his thoughts and affections were instantly turned towards heaven, his devotion showed itself in the most ardent prayers and aspirations. He had been twenty years a missionary in America, during which time he created the principal religious establishments in the Missouri, and undertook immense labours for the glory of God. He had visited the Osages three times, and several times travelled over the vast territory north-west of the Missouri, raising churches, and labouring with his own hands in building them. In the midst of his greatest labours, his favourite exclamation was ; “ *how sweet it is to labour in company with the angels, for the salvation and happiness of men.*”

NOVA SCOTIA.—This island, with Cape Breton and some other small islands, forms one district, under the Right Rev. Dr. Frazer. The population of Nova Scotia is about 150,000 ; that of Cape Breton, 14,000. The number of Catholics reaches 60,000. The Indians scarcely amount to 1,400, they are scattered, and have four or five chapels ; the chief one is in a small island near Cape Breton. His lordship has eighteen priests, who are obliged to travel constantly from place to place, over a wild rough country, carrying with them a missal, chalice, altar-stone, and ornaments. They subsist wholly on the voluntary contributions of the faithful, many of whom are too poor to pay the usual contribution of four crowns. The Society for Propagating the Faith, furnishes the bishop with the means of supplying the ornaments necessary for the altar, and

of keeping a few students at the Propaganda College in Rome, and in the seminaries of Quebec and Charlestown. This society has just sent out two missionaries to Siam, which has lately been increasing in importance, and now contains several new missions. Father Smet, S. J., who had been obliged to return to Europe on account of bad health, embarked in October at Havre, in company with five young men, received as novices of the society in America, and M. Parg, a priest of the diocese of Bardstown, who was anxious to return to that mission, even without waiting for his bishop, Monsignor Flaget, whose return has been delayed by different circumstances.

AFRICA — Algiers. Five sisters of St. Joseph opened in 1835 an hospital for cholera patients at Algiers; their work is now considerably enlarged, one hundred sick persons are gratuitously relieved; and two hundred girls receive instruction,—amongst them are admitted forty or fifty Jewish girls, and one or two Moorish families have sent their children to their school. An additional supply of sisters of the order, with a priest at their head, has sailed for the same city.

ASIA.—The Emperor of Cochinchina, Minch Hang, as we learn from a letter from India, published in the beginning of 1836 a decree against Christianity, containing the severest penalties against its professors, and ordering every family to be put to death that shall harbour any European. The governor of the town is to share their punishment; and the mandarin of the province is to suffer the bastinado, and to be degraded. European vessels are to trade only at Tourana; the mandarin is to take a list of the crew and passengers on their arrival, and compare them at their departure; escorting the vessel out of the port, that none may return to land. Every European found on shore is to be put to death. Chinese ships may trade at all the ports, but they are to be strictly searched.

EXTRACTS from an Article contained in the 58th Number of the “Annals of the Society for THE PROPAGATION OF THE FAITH,” published at Lyons, for May 1838.

The Article commences with the following Account Current for 1837: —“The hopes which we expressed in presenting the account for 1836, have not been disappointed: Heaven has blessed our efforts, and the Society for the Propagation of the Faith has again received, during the past year, considerable accessions of strength.

The Council of Paris has received:

	<i>fr.</i>	<i>c.</i>	
From France and her Colonies	393,632	46	} 457,762 59
From Belgium	61,458	34	
From England	2,384	55	
From Holland	227	24	
From Portugal	60	0	

The Council of Lyons has received:

From France and her Colonies	39,976	56
From Switzerland . . .	17,858	65
From Savoy	14,790	60
From Piedmont	12,356	97
From Italy	17,025	89
From Germany	6,335	99

From Russia	.	.	.	584	6
From the Levant	.	.	.	793	5
				In all	469,541 77
					<hr/>
Amount of receipts	927,304 36
Surplus in hand	408 57
					<hr/>
TOTAL					927,712 93
					<hr/>

“ The distribution of the funds among the various missions has been decreed as follows :

“ To the Seminary of the Missions Etrangères, in the Rue de Bac, a sum of 165,341 francs, for the following missions :

Corea	16,900
Fo-Kien, in China	1,620
Su-Tchuen, Yu-Nan, and Kouï-Tcheou, in the empire of China	17,320
West Tong-King	34,211
Cochin China, Camboge, and Laos	32,110
Siam, and the kingdom of Quéda	19,440
The Malabars	20,250
The Seminary of Pulo-Pinang	5,670
For the extraordinary expenses of commission of Macao	17,820

TOTAL . 165,341

To the Lazaristes, a sum of 84,400 francs for the following Missions :

Constantinople, colleges and mission	8,400
The mission and college of Smyrna	5,040
Mission at Naxia	1,680
Mission at Santorin	840
Mission at Salonica	1,680
Mission at Aleppo	4,200
Mission and school at Damascus	3,360
Mission and colleges at Antoura	6,720
Mission of Tripoli, Sgorta, and Eden	1,680
Mission of Macao, and the novitiate of the Chinese	12,900
For the little seminary of Mongolie, in Tartary	8,500
For the mission of Nanking	4,200
That of Kiang-Si	7,560
That of Hou-Quang	9,240
Travelling expenses of two Missionaries	8,400

TOTAL . 84,400

For the following missions of the Society of Jesus, a sum of 48,000 francs :

Maryland	16,800
The Missouri	12,000
Kentucky and New Orleans	7,200

Madeira	4,800	
Syria	2,400	
Mount Libanus and Chaldea	4,800	
	<hr/>	
TOTAL .	48,000	
	<hr/>	
To Monsignor Rouchouse, bishop of Nilopolis, vicar apostolic of the Western Pacific	43,671	0
To Mgr. Pompallier, bishop of Maronea, vicar apostolic of the Eastern Pacific	33,200	0
To Mgr. Cao, bishop of Zama, vicar apostolic of Ava & Pegu	3,000	0
To Mgr. Pessoni, bishop of Esbona, vicar apostolic of Thibet and Hindostan	4,500	0
To Mgr. de Sainte Anne, bishop of Amata, vicar apostolic of Verapolis (East Indies)	4,500	0
To Mgr. Abbucarim, bishop of Alia, vicar apostolic of the Egyptian Copts	3,000	0
For the mission of Tripoli, in Barbary	1,500	0
For the mission at Tunis	1,500	0
To Mgr. Talbas, Syrian Catholic archbishop of Mardin	1,500	0
To Mgr. Bonamie, archbishop of Smyrna	9,000	0
To Mgr. Hillereau, vicar apostolic, patriarch of Constantinople	6,000	0
To Mgr. Blancis, bishop of Syra, vicar apostolic of Greece	6,000	0
To Mgr. Fleming, bishop of Carparia, vicar apostolic of Newfoundland and Labrador	9,672	40
To Mgr. Fraser, bp. of Tanen, vicar apostolic of Nova Scotia	9,000	0
To Mgr. Provencher, bishop of Juliopolis, for the mission of Hudson's Bay	9,000	0
To Mgr. Eccleston, archbishop of Baltimore	3,000	0
To Mgr. Flaget, bishop of Bardstown	21,856	80
To Mgr. Purcell, bishop of Cincinnati	18,000	0
To Mgr. Rezé, bishop of Detroit	9,545	50
To Mgr. Bruté, bishop of Vincennes	27,000	0
To Mgr. Rosati, bishop of St. Louis	18,000	0
To Mgr. Portier, bishop of Mobile	2,180	0
To Mgr. Blanc, bishop of New Orleans	15,000	0
To Mgr. England, bishop of Charlestown	6,000	0
To Mgr. Dubois, bishop of New York	15,000	0
To Mgr. Kenrick, administrator of the diocese of Philadelphia	6,000	0
To Mgr. Fenwick, bishop of Boston	12,000	0
To Mgr. Macdonald, bishop of Olympus, vicar apostolic of the English Antillas	10,500	0
For the missions of Guiana	6,000	0
To Mgr. Polding, vicar apostolic of Australasia	15,000	0
Charges for printing, and other incidental expenses	72,745	37
Surplus in hand	227,100	86
	<hr/>	
SUM TOTAL .	927,712	93

The article, after communicating a great mass of the most interesting information, and, in particular, warm recommendations of the Society from several of the bishops of the continent of Europe, concludes with the following remarkable words: "It would be idle in us to attempt to add anything to such numerous and pressing recommendations. What effect could our words produce, after what has been said by those to whom it has been given to govern the Church of God? Still, in order to crown this splendid mass of exhortation and panegyric with a fitting conclusion, we will confine ourselves simply to recalling the words of the Supreme Head of the whole Church, repeating what he was pleased lately to communicate to a holy bishop, and many other persons, with an express injunction to convey the intelligence to us: 'THAT THIS SOCIETY FOR THE PROPAGATION OF THE FAITH IS, IN THE MIDST OF THE AFFLICTIONS THAT OPPRESS HIM, THE CONSOLATION RESERVED TO HIS HEART; THAT ITS SUCCESSES ARE HIS JOY, AND THAT HE COUNTS ON THE MEMBERS OF THIS ASSOCIATION FOR THE SUPPORT OF THE MISSIONS.' We hasten to enable all the subscribers to participate in this precious testimony of the satisfaction felt by the common father of the faithful, confident that they will find in it, as we do, new motives to redouble their zeal, and to increase more and more the fruits of their charity."

NOTICES OF BOOKS.

On Education and Self-formation, based upon Physical, Intellectual, Moral, and Religious Principles—from the German of Dr. J. C. A. Heinroth—Schloss, 1838.—Of this work a part only relates to Education in the ordinary sense of the word—the concluding chapters treat of the 'self-formation' of the grown-up individual, the proper exercise of the will, and the view that he should take of his position, as a moral, social, and accountable being. We can sincerely recommend this treatise to our readers, but particularly that portion of it which relates to education; the author goes into no details—does not attempt to lay down any *system*; he divides youth into three periods: "Infancy, including the period of play; the period of learning; and the preliminary period of development; during which, the preparation for, and entrance into maturity takes place—p. 69." Taking the clearest and most elevated view of the great object of Education, he proceeds to point out the end to be attained, and the direction to be given to the child during each of these periods, and lays down general principles and rules of action, so universal in their application, so admirable in the knowledge they indicate of human nature and of its characteristics in childhood, and above all so wise and christian in the place they assign to religion as the main spring of the character, that we think none who are concerned in the training of youth, can fail to receive valuable instruction, and to find food for their own reflections, in the profound thoughts of the author. The latter part of the work,

where man is considered as a free agent, treats chiefly of religion, and the place which it ought to occupy in his heart and conduct. As the learned author is a Protestant, it necessarily happens that he entertains many erroneous opinions, and has failed to avoid that indecision of ideas, and coldness of feeling, which a Catholic will detect in the writings even of the most amiable of those who dissent from the true religion: but it contains much that is admirable, and we find no sectarian bitterness that could give offence, or prevent our cordially recommending it to general perusal.

The Catholic Mission in Australasia: by W. Ullathorne, D.D. Keating and Brown, 1838.—This pamphlet we would gladly see in the hands of every Catholic family in the Country; the sacred cause it advocates, the immense regions into whose social and spiritual condition it affords us an insight, and the ability of the reverend Author in doing justice to his subject, combine to give it an indescribable interest; and independant of all higher considerations, it contains much curious general information. Dr. Ullathorne tells us, that for five years he has conversed, and almost lived, with the convict. “I have often received him on his arrival in New South Wales; I have thrice visited him in Van Dieman’s Land; I have attended him in his barracks; I have followed him through every district of the country to his place of assignment; I have collected him from the ploughing oxen in the fields—from the sheep wandering in their vast tracts—and from the wild cattle in their distant runs. I have been familiar with him in every township, and on every highway; I have celebrated the mysterious rites of our religion in the bark hut, beneath the gum tree in the valley, and on the blue mountain’s top, which the white cloud covers. The daughter of crime has burdened my ear with her tale of folly and of woe; the dark-faced man has come to me, in his dress of shame and clanking fetters, from the degraded iron-gang; the sentenced criminal has wrung my heart, filling my eyes, in the cell of death. I have twice sailed with him to that last region on earth of crime and despair, Norfolk Island. He has confided himself to me like a brother to an afflicted brother, and has poured his whole soul into my breast.” Truly deplorable are the descriptions which follow of the state of these unhappy creatures, their degradation, going on from bad to worse, their misery, and their hopelessness; and how divine does religion appear, how intense is our feeling of its truth, when we see it reach, and penetrate, the heart of man, even in this hardened state; and awakening the vital principle within him, enable him to break the strongest bonds of Satan, and regain in his soul the lost image of his Creator; that such have been its blessed effects, where it has found access, Dr. Ullathorne proves by various instances, some of which we cannot refrain from quoting:—“In 1834, a conspiracy was formed by the prisoners to destroy the military and seize the island. They were defeated, and thirty-one of their number condemned to death. In 1835, I sailed to the island to prepare such of them as might be Catholic to meet their end. My unexpected appearance, late on the night of my arrival, came on them like a vision. I found them crowded in three cells, so small as barely

to allow their lying down together—their upper garments thrown off for a little coolness. They had for six months been looking for their fate. I had to announce life to all but thirteen—to these, death. A few words of preparation, and then their fate. Those who were to live wept bitterly; whilst those doomed to die, without exception, dropped on their knees, and, with dry eyes, thanked God they were to be delivered from so horrid a place. Who can describe our emotions? I found only three of the condemned to be Catholic—four others wished me to take them also to my care. During the five days permitted for preparation, they manifested extraordinary fervour of repentance. The morning come, they received on their knees the sentence as the will of God. Loosened from their chains, they fell down in the dust, and, in the warmth of their gratitude, kissed the very feet that had brought them peace. Their death moved many of their comrades. On the two successive days of execution and burial, I preached, from the graves of the dead, to their former associates. During the week still allowed before the departure of the ship, twenty conversions followed, and one hundred and fifty general confessions. I left books behind me before departure, arranged a form of prayer for their use on Sunday, and obtained the appointment of one as reader, whose duty also it should be to teach those to read who were unable, in the intervals between labour and food.

“ At the close of 1836, my good Bishop permitted me again to visit Norfolk Island,—a duty I had much at heart. I was received with great joy by my poor penitents, who, through all sorts of ridicule and persecution from their comrades, had persevered in their resolutions. I admitted them to the holy communion. Nearly sixty had learned to read their prayer books. The Commandant assured me that crime had considerably diminished, and that the Catholics were remarkably attentive to their duties of religion. Let me not forget how much of this was owing to the prudence and solicitude of the Commandant himself. I record the name of Major Anderson with unmingled satisfaction. His minute personal knowledge of the desperate men under his charge, and the discrimination with which he encourages the well disposed, whilst he strikes terror into the obstinate, has been attended with most salutary consequences. What was my delight to find that, for the fifteen months elapsed since my last visit, there was not one Catholic to be brought before the judge. During the fifteen days allowed me before our return, three hundred confessions, and twelve conversions, rewarded my labours. I saw these dreaded characters come to the arms of religion like children. What may she not do with men when every hope from this world is departed, and nothing appears on their path but sufferings? The penitents, now become the greater number of Catholics, begged to be locked up in separate wards from the rest, that they might say their morning and night prayers together. Except these two visits, no priest has been at Norfolk Island. Since my arrival in England, I have received a letter from one of these poor prisoners, who consoles me in these terms:—

“ ‘ REV. SIR,—Aware that your insignia is ‘ *Non ignarus mali, miseriis*

succurere disco, therefore I feel no hesitation in writing. I rejoice to have to inform you that of the many who received your instructions, there are none, I am aware of, returned to their former wickedness; but notwithstanding the many enemies they have to encounter, the many instruments employed by Satan to debar them from those duties due to their Creator, they have withstood all. I have also to inform you that in addition to the number which seemed to be zealous heretofore, there are three times that number at present. They are all desirous to learn, to be instructed, and earnestly look for books; even those who have not attended you during that happy time you have been with us, want books. The wicked are constantly endeavouring to bring back to their former vice, those in whom they perceive any conversion. We earnestly request you will not be long *absent* from us. The constant prayers of your most humble but unfortunate servant,

ROBERT HEPBURN.

Who can read this passage and contrast it with the foregoing frightful picture of the state from which these men were raised to become Christian penitents, and not feel his heart throb with emotion, at the fervid appeal with which Dr. Ullathorne concludes his address. "We have given ourselves—we have nothing left; we call on you for help. If, in your love of God, you would see banished from before his face this army of crime, which offends him—help us. If, in your charity, you look out for the poorest objects, if those most lost, if those who have least aid within themselves—help us. If you would descend to the deepest miseries, and carry down there the most blessed good, and pour it out to the greatest number of the unhappy—assist us. If you would aspire to a godlike work, if to emulate the perfection of that Eternal Father, whose work is the creation of good, and the diffusion of light through the places of darkness, and the preparation of enjoyment, co-operate with him in the divinest of all his divine works, the salvation of the fallen—help us.

If you would be associated in the redemption of Christ, who came down with sacrifice to deliver us when heathens, and preached to the souls in prison—help us. If to share in the merits of our apostleship without the toil, and in our blessed consolations without the sacrifice—if to combine the works of mercy spiritual with those corporal, and present them in one act to Christ—help us. If to these despairing thousands you would be as the visible providence of God—if at that last dread day you would hear their appealing voices on your behalf, '*The Lord sent this his angel, who delivered me out of prison*'—if, in that great hour, you would hear from the Eternal Son the decision of your election, '*I was in prison and ye come unto me*'—if you would snatch from perdition these souls, wash them in the blood of the cross, and place them, as celestial rubies, in your own immortal crown—bring to us help." May this appeal be heard!

In another point of view this mission is of immense importance; New Zealand is included in the vast diocese of our Australasian Bishop—and this most interesting country seems even to invite Christianity. Dr. Ullathorne tells us, that shortly after the arrival of the Bishop in

Sydney, two of the children of chiefs, a young man, and woman, were sent to him by their countrymen expressly to hear of the Catholic religion; they were instructed, baptised, and returned to their country, where such an impression was made by their account of all that they had seen and heard, that great interest was awakened, and one chief sent a message to the Bishop, requesting to receive instruction and baptism. Moreover, in the success of this mission, lies the chief hope of civilizing the natives of this vast country, and saving them from the fate of so many of the Aborigines, who have come into contact with Europeans—vice, wretchedness, and, finally, extirpation. Already is this deplorable course in progress.

“These poor creatures have often been treated by the convicts, at the out stations, with atrocious barbarity; who have even been known to shoot them, as game for sport. From these they have acquired our language in its most degraded dialect. From these they have been initiated into more than our worst vices. Their women have been shockingly treated. Where the European population is thickest, they are fast dying off. The tribe nearest Sydney has no longer more than five or six persons, and not one child to succeed their fathers. The tribes of Van Dieman's Land are nearly extinct; there do not remain more than 150 souls, and these are now placed on an island in Bass's Straits, and supported by government. This extermination of nearly a whole race has been the work of twenty years.”

Dr. Ullathorne regrets that these poor creatures have, as yet, been totally unattended to, the more pressing claims of the unhappy convicts having required all, and more than all, that the means of the mission could supply. In an article in our last number, we advocated the ‘Society for propagating the Catholic Faith,’ established at Lyons,* and as an evidence of the spirit which animates the Society, our readers will rejoice to hear that when Dr. Ullathorne represented that Government would contribute to the maintenance of a certain number of Priests, but that he had not the means to carry them to the mission, he at once received from the Society a supply of several hundred pounds towards this most desirable object.

Recollections of a Convert, or a relation of her conversion, with a few verses at different periods, collected first as a New Year's offering to her Convent friends—Keating & Brown, 1838.—This little work is written with great simplicity and earnestness, and in a strain of enthusiasm, which appears to have been nursed in Conventual seclusion; the Authoress, who is a relative of the Hon. and Rev. G. Spencer, delights to consider herself an especial favourite of Heaven, and to dwell upon the workings of her own mind, and the influence of grace upon her heart. There is nothing in the work to interest the general reader: the verses are below mediocrity, and the incidents of her life are few and of a kind which are ordinary with those who, to use her own words, have received “that greatest of all graces, to come from the bosom of a Protestant family to the knowledge of the true Church;” p. 33. Yet this short story will be read with pleasure and edification, by those who,

* See the powerful appeal of the Holy Father, *ant.* p. 273.

like the holy souls for whom it was at first intended, can sympathize with the genuine and fervent feelings of a truly Christian heart.

Celestial Scenery, by T. Dick, LL.D.—Ward & Co. 1838.—This work, with a very fanciful title and much that is fanciful in its ideas, contains valuable and interesting information. Its object is “to shew that the arguments which may be brought forward to establish the doctrine of a plurality of worlds, have all the force of a *moral demonstration*—that they throw a lustre on the perfections of the Divinity, and that the opposite opinion is utterly inconsistent with every idea we ought to entertain of an all-wise and Omnipotent Intelligence.”—p. 7. We have not space to follow the arguments, but the facts by which they are supported are arranged in a manner most likely to attract and interest all popular readers.

Observations on the use and abuse of the sacred Scriptures: by Dr. Ullathorne. Keating & Brown, 1838.

Transubstantiation, &c. a Letter to the Rt. Hon. Lord ———, in reply to certain Enquiries. By the Rev. John Fletcher, D.D. Keating and Brown, 1836.—We are obliged, for want of space, to content ourselves with saying that these treatises well maintain the reputation of their distinguished authors.

Essays on Natural History, chiefly Ornithology, by Chas. Waterton, Esq. author of *Wanderings in South America*; with an *Autobiography of the Author, and a View of Walton Hall*. Longman & Co. 1838. Accident has prevented us from giving a lengthened notice of this delightful work. We have however seen enough to warrant the strongest recommendation of it, and particularly the very lively and amusing autobiography. We hope to have an article on both Mr. Waterton's works in an early number.

The Université Catholique for March 1838, contains, 1. Course of Social Economy (9th lecture), by M. de Coux.—2. Course of Political Economy (continuation of the 14th lecture), by M. de Villeneuve Bargemont).—3. Course of Astronomy (6th lecture), by M. Desdouts. Method of fixing the position of places on the earth's surface—geographical longitude, latitude, and altitude—different methods employed for their determination, as well on sea as on land—the spherical form of the earth considered with respect to its effect on the methods of computing time—the antipodes—historical digression on this subject—the earth's form considered as resulting from the rotatory movement and the centrifugal force—singular agreement of this theory with the first verses of Genesis.—4. Review of the situation of the Prussian Government with respect to its Catholic Subjects (continuation and end).—5. Religion in Modern Societies, by M. Guizot.—6. The History of the Middle Ages, from the Fall of the Western Empire to the Death of Charlemagne, by J. Moeller.—7. Elements of Astronomy, made applicable to Geography, by M. P. M. Perdrau.—8. Notices of New Books.

The Number for April 1838, contains, 1. Course upon the History of Political Economy (15th lecture), by M. de Villeneuve-Bargemont. Upon the political economy of France and Europe since the restoration—Revolution of 1830—Saint Simonians—the Fouriéristes.—2. The Monumental History of the Early Christians (12th lecture), by M.

Cyprien Robert.—3. History of Christian Poetry (3rd lecture), by M. Douhaire.—4. Review—Lacordaire's Letter upon the Holy See, by M. Chernel—Philosophical and Literary Letters upon MM. de la Mennais, Lermnier, and Georges Sand (1st letter), by M. Léon Boré—Universal Truth, serving as an introduction to the Philosophy of the Word, H. de Lourdoneix, by the Baron Guiraud—Literature of Italy (2nd article), by Eugène de la Gournerie—An Enquiry into the state of Protestantism in England.—5. Notices of Books.

The Number for May contains, 1. Course on the History of Political Economy (15th lecture continued).—2. Course of Astronomy (7th lecture), by M. Desdouts.—3. The 10th lecture on Religious and Profane Music, by M. d'Ortigue.—4. Review—On the Blessings of the Earth, by H. M.—On French Prisons (4th article), by M. Lamache—Remarks on the mode of ascertaining the period of the ancient Egyptian Year.—5. Notices of Books.

The Annals of Christian Philosophy for March 1838, contain, 1. Manual of the History of the Middle Age, by Moeller.—2. J. Voigt's History of Pope Gregory VII and his Age (2nd article), by Audley.—3. Marvellous Instincts of Insects (2nd article).—4. Filon's History of Europe to the Sixteenth Century, by Barthelemy de Las Casas, and the Indians.—5. De Matrimonio, Operâ et Studio J. Carriere.—6. History of the Mother of God, completed from the Traditions of the East, the Writings of the Fathers, and the Manners of the Hebrews, by the Abbé Orsini.—7. The Domestic Circle, by the Princess de Craon.—8. Notices of Books.

The Number for April contains, 1. Diplomatic Dictionary, or Philological and Historical Account of Civil and Ecclesiastical Antiquities (8th article), by Bonnetty.—2. Treatise upon the Ecclesiastical Property of the Abbé Affre, Vicar-General of Paris, by M. de Villeneuve-Bargemont.—3. Hurter's History of Pope Innocent III and his contemporaries, by Erlinger.—4. Analysis of an inedited work of P. Prémare's upon the Vestiges of Christian Dogmas to be found in Chinese Books (4th article), A. Bonnetty.—5. Notices of Books.

The Number for May contains, 1. Translation into French of the Evangelical Preparation of Eusebius of Cesarea, with Notes by Ségnier.—2. An Account of Darius the Mede, and Balthasar, King of Babylon, by M. E. Quatremère.—3. An Atheist converted to Christianity, to the Believer and the Infidel, posthumous work of M. Delauro Dubez.—4. Analysis of an unpublished work by P. Prémare, on the traces of Christian Dogmas in Chinese Works (5th article).—5. The Fall of an Angel, by Lamartine.—6. Notices of Books.

ERRATA.

- Page 81, line 12, for "Ginghené," read *Ginguené*.
 82, line 3 from bottom, for "Eremeland," read *Culm*.
 83, line 4 from bottom, for "Wirtemberg," read *Wittenberg*.
 94, line 1, for "s'intrè," read *s'entri*.
 94, line 2, for "sie," read *si è*.
 104, line 7, for "insect," read *fishery*.

CATHOLIC INSTITUTE OF GREAT BRITAIN.

WE have great pleasure in announcing that this undertaking is assuming a definite and substantial form. Under the patronage of our Bishops and Clergy, and of its distinguished President and Vice-Presidents, the labours of its Committee cannot fail, we trust, to be crowned with success. Considerable subscriptions have been received, and before our next Number appears, we hope the Institute will be in active operation. We subjoin the Resolutions and Address put forward by the Committee, together with a Letter received by them from our venerable Vicars Apostolic.

Resolutions passed at Meetings held for the purpose of organizing a Catholic Institute.

1. That a CATHOLIC INSTITUTE be formed, for the under-mentioned purposes, which have been sanctioned by the Vicars Apostolic.

2. That all the Catholic Prelates of Great Britain shall be members of the Institute, without any contribution save what they may voluntarily choose to give.

3. That all the Catholic Priests in Great Britain, having faculties or approved of, be also members of the Institute upon the same terms.

4. That every individual of the Catholic Laity, who shall contribute not less than six shillings by the year, or six pence by the month, shall be a member; and shall continue to be a member so long as such contribution shall be paid.

5. That the objects of the Institute shall be confined to the exposure of the falsehood of the calumnious charges made against the Catholic religion, to the defence of the real tenets of Catholicity, to the circulation of all useful knowledge upon the above-mentioned subjects; and to the protection of the poorer classes of Catholics in the enjoyment of their religious principles and practices.

6. That the affairs of the Institute shall be under the management of a President, Vice-Presidents, a Treasurer, and Secretary, to be elected as hereinafter mentioned, and of a Committee to be constituted as hereinafter mentioned.

7. That the Right Honourable the Earl of Shrewsbury be President of the Institute.

8. That all Catholic Peers, and Members of Parliament, contributors to the Institute, be *ex officio* Vice-Presidents, if, upon application to them, they will accept such office; and that there be twelve Vice-Presidents, to be elected by the Committee.

9. That the President, Vice-Presidents, Treasurer, and Secretary, shall be *ex officio* members of the Committee; and that in addition to them, the Committee shall consist of all the Catholic Bishops and Clergy of Great Britain,

members of the Institute, of such Peers and Members of Parliament as may contribute to the funds of the Institute, and of Twenty-one Laymen (to be elected as hereinafter mentioned), with power to increase that number to any number not exceeding fifty.

10. That an Annual Meeting of the members shall be held in London on the second Wednesday in the month of May, at which the Secretary and Twenty-one Lay Members of the Committee shall be elected; and that at such meeting an account of the funds and of the proceedings of the Institute, its condition and prospects, shall be laid before the members, and that the discussion at such meeting shall be limited to the foregoing objects.

11. That the funds of the Institute shall be applied by the Committee in providing a suitable place of meeting, and in recompensing the Secretary, and such officers as they may consider to be necessary for the purpose of conducting the affairs and keeping the accounts of the Institute; and that a farther portion of the funds shall be applied in printing and circulating such publications as, having the previous sanction of a clergyman duly authorized by the Vicar Apostolic of the London district, may be deemed most useful to obviate calumny, to explain Catholic tenets, and defend the purity and truth of Catholic doctrines, and circulate useful information on these subjects.

12. That the Committee shall also undertake the examination of all cases of religious oppression or deprivation of rights of conscience of the poorer and less protected classes of Catholics, under any circumstances.

13. That the Committee shall be authorized to appoint sub-committees, of not less than five members, out of their own body, for any purposes of the Institute; and also to organize local committees, and to solicit and avail themselves of the co-operation of individuals in different parts of Great Britain and the Colonies.

14. That all questions, whether in Committee or at meetings, shall be decided by a majority of votes, the Chairman having a casting vote in cases of equality; and that five members shall constitute a quorum of the Committee.

15. That Mr. Henry Robinson be appointed Treasurer to the Institute.

16. That Mr. James Smith be appointed Secretary to the Institute.

THE COMMITTEE of the CATHOLIC INSTITUTE consider it to be their first duty to make known to their Fellow-Catholics, throughout Great Britain, the design and objects of that Institution, and to solicit their earnest and zealous co-operation. To this end, therefore, they propose to circulate, as widely as possible, the fundamental articles upon which it has been founded. From these may be collected as well the objects of the Institute, as the system on which it is intended to give them practical effect. They are essentially the vindication of our holy religion from the calumnious defamation of modern adversaries, and the protection of its poorer and more defenceless adherents from oppression for conscience sake.

In the discussions preliminary to the Establishment of the Institute, it was suggested, that as it could not be doubted that such an association would receive the general concurrence and support of the entire body of British Catholics, it might be placed on a more enlarged basis, and embrace other objects of great utility. After much consideration,

however, it was determined to confine it *strictly* to its present purposes. The motive to this resolution, was a desire to secure that unanimity and concentration in the Catholic body which seemed indispensable to the success of the undertaking, by the selection of such objects only of undoubted importance as appeared to be beyond the possibility of objection.

As a large step towards the general approbation of their Catholic countrymen, the Committee are happy to announce that the Institute has already received the high sanction of every Vicar Apostolic in England and Scotland, and that numerous accessions from the general body of the Clergy, including some of the most eminent amongst them, for piety and learning, afford good ground to hope for the general co-operation of that venerable class of our Community.

British Catholics have been frequently taunted by their adversaries, and sometimes reproached even by their friends, for want of concert in the pursuit of their common interests. Indeed, the alleged experience of the past has suggested in some quarters the apprehension that *this* institution may, by the same cause, be limited in its exertions, if not in its very existence. The Committee, however, without discussing the question whether the charge as respects the past be groundless, or well founded, feel confident that on the present occasion, there is no cause for such apprehension. Between this and all former associations, a wide and obvious difference exists. Those were formed under the influence of severe and actual oppression, and whilst the body at large was stamped by the law with the marks of inferiority and degradation. Moreover the object of such associations was of partial, and in some degree exclusive, interest, being the recovery of secular privileges which from their very nature must be unequal in their distribution.

Happily, here the circumstances and objects are wholly different. Catholics have been for many years restored to political equality : we have freely mixed with our fellow-countrymen, in the transaction of public affairs, and may now assume the tone, and exercise the rights of freemen without challenge or exception, and it is not conceivable that the objects contemplated can contain any elements of disunion. They regard not matters of temporal or secular interest. They aim at higher ends; at ends in which every member of our community, however high or low may be his rank or station, has a common and equal concern, namely, the glory of God and the good of our neighbour.

It is notorious that the most vigorous efforts are daily made to check the progress of our holy religion. Argument, conducted fairly and candidly, Catholics would rather court than discountenance, knowing that ultimately it must assist more than retard the advancement of truth. But many have recourse to other weapons. They pervert our tenets, misrepresent our religious observances, and calumniate without scruple the characters of some of the purest amongst the professors of our creed, without regard to sex or station. Silence and supineness under such circumstances would be unjust to our fellow christians of other denominations. They might reasonably believe, that charges thus boldly made,

were passed over only because they could not be contradicted: and we should consequently become indirect but efficient agents in the delusion.

If the objects of the Institute are in themselves laudable, or free from reasonable objection, the mode in which it is proposed to effect them, will be not less so. For it is intended ever to keep carefully in remembrance, that the maintenance of Truth is the *sole* design and end of this incorporation. Thus, while its members will feel themselves called upon to promote through the proper channel, the prompt and vigorous refutation and exposure of the misrepresentations and calumnies complained of, so that the antidote may closely follow and neutralize the poison, they will sedulously avoid the course which they condemn in others, as being plainly inconsistent with that sacred purpose.—Virulence, harshness, and irritation, are the usual accompaniments, and indeed indications of error. The calm dignity of truth disclaims their support. Its appropriate and powerful arms are moderation and charity, which are nevertheless perfectly compatible with energy and active utility.

It is then to an undertaking, formed for carrying out objects which must be dear to every Catholic, in a temperate and Christianlike spirit, that the Committee of the Institute earnestly invite the attention and support of their Catholic countrymen, and they confidently hope that the appeal will not be in vain.

CHARLES LANGDALE,
Chairman of the Committee.

3, Crosby Row, Walworth Road,
London, July 26th, 1838.

SIR,—By the direction of the Committee of the Catholic Institute, I beg to call your attention to the accompanying Resolutions and Address, and to inform you, that the following Noblemen and Gentlemen have consented to become Vice-Presidents of the Institute:—

THE EARL OF NEWBURGH

LORD CLIFFORD

LORD LOVAT

THE HON. CHARLES LANGDALE, M. P.

SIR HENRY BEDINGFIELD, BART.

DANIEL O'CONNELL, Esq. M. P.

PHILIP H. HOWARD, Esq. M. P.

A. H. LYNCH, Esq. M. P.

CHARLES TOWNELEY, Esq.

WM. CONSTABLE MAXWELL, Esq.

JOHN MENZIES, Esq. (Pitfodels)

WM. LAWSON, Esq. (Brough Hall)

AMBROSE L. PHILLIPPS, Esq.

PHILIP JONES, Esq.

JAMES WHEBLE, Esq.

ROBERT BERKELEY, Esq.

Answers have not yet been received from several other gentlemen who have been applied to. Subscriptions and contributions may be forwarded to the Treasurer, at the Bank of Messrs. Wright & Co. 6, Henrietta-street, Covent Garden, or to the Secretary.

I have the honour to be, Sir,

Your obedient servant,

JAMES SMITH, *Secretary.*

Letter of the English Vicars Apostolic in reference to the Institute.

HON. AND DEAR SIR,

York, May 12, 1838.

In the month of March, you did each of us, the Vicars Apostolic in England, the honour of transmitting a copy of a letter signed by you as Chairman of the preparatory meeting of the Catholic Institute of Great Britain. The letter submits to our consideration a plan for the formation of this Society, and specifies also the objects and the means of the proposed Catholic Institute.

At the time, we merely acknowledged the receipt of your much-valued communication, and deferred expressing our sentiments on its important contents, until we should meet and confer together on the subject. Having now given to every part of your letter our very serious consideration, we hasten to say that we rejoice much to see the zeal that is manifested in your proposed undertaking, and that we confidently trust much good will result from its efforts. We fully agree with you, that prejudice and bigotry are awakened and increased by the means to which your letter refers, and we think it high time that there should be a General Association among us to oppose the efforts of these promoters of bigotry. We are, at the same time, anxious that our good and holy cause should be defended in a dignified manner; and that, in the tracts and other publications which shall issue from our press, there should be nothing low or violent. To prevent this evil arising, as also to secure the orthodoxy and sound morality of these tracts and other publications, we deem it necessary that they shall all be submitted to the inspection of an Ecclesiastic, who shall be named by the Vicar Apostolic of London.

We beg leave furthermore respectfully to state, that we see many objections to a part of the Fund of the Catholic Institute being applied to the erection of Chapels, as mentioned in No. II of your letter. We think the work of erecting Chapels is too intricate and various, to be successfully managed by a General Committee.

The other proposed objects of the Catholic Institute may, we think, be better attained by a general co-operation and a General Committee; and for the attainment of them, we have much pleasure in giving our united and cordial sanction, and shall be happy, at all times, to lend all the assistance in our power.

Hon. and dear Sir,

With sincere esteem and much respect,

We have the honour to be,

Your humble and faithful Servants,

+ P. A. BAINES, Vic. Ap. West. Dis.

+ T. C. WALSH, Vic. Ap. Mid. Dis.

+ J. BRIGGS, Vic. Ap. North. Dis.

+ T. GRIFFITHS, Vic. Ap. London Dis.

*The Hon Charles Langdale, M.P.**31, Jermyn Street, London.*

THE DUBLIN REVIEW.

OCTOBER 1838.

ART. I.—1. *Tracts for the Times.* 3 vols. 8vo. London. 1833-36.

2. *The Works of that learned and judicious Divine, Mr. Richard Hooker.* A new edition, with additions, arranged by the Rev. John Keble. 3 vols. 8vo. Oxford, 1836.

IN our first article upon the "*Tracts for the Times*," we reserved for future discussion the momentous question, how far the claim advanced in them, on behalf of the Anglican Church, to the rights and privileges of apostolical succession, is valid. To this task we now apply ourselves, with the full consciousness of our inability to do justice to the subject, in the confined limits of an article in a review. Gladly would we, therefore, hold back from the discussion, till leisure and circumstances gave us opportunity for a more finished as well as more extensive examination of the foundations of the English church. We do not express these sentiments from any regret at the pledge we have given, nor from any desire to retreat from its obligation; for we felt when we gave it even as we do now. But we were urged on by a sense of duty; and the pressure of that feeling continues yet. Not a moment's time, we seriously believe, is to be lost in fixing the attention of the Catholic mind upon the true and novel position of our controversy with the reviving ideas of the old Protestant theology; and if we can only point out the track upon which bolder genius and deeper research than ours may follow up the attack, our duty as Reviewers will have been amply discharged. For the periodical press attached to any great interest, should, we have always judged, act the part of sentinels or watchmen, giving notice of the first appearance of danger and of the approach of a new foe, to those whose office it is to man the bulwarks and defend the walls of their holy Sion.

The "*Tracts for the Times*" are for ever inculcating upon their readers, the belief that the Anglican Church possesses authority by apostolic descent. We will first establish this point by a few extracts, in addition to several quoted in our former article.

“ We have been born, not of blood, nor of the will of the flesh, nor of the will of man, but of God. The Lord Jesus Christ gave his spirit to his Apostles ; they, in their turn, laid their hands upon those who should succeed them ; and these, again, on others : and so the sacred gift has been handed down to our present bishops, who have appointed us as their assistants, and, in some respects, their representatives.”—No. i. p. 2.

“ We, who believe in the Nicene Creed, must acknowledge it a high privilege that we belong to the apostolic Church. How is it that most of us are, almost avowedly, so cold and indifferent in our thoughts of this privilege ? For many years we have been much in the habit of resting our claim on the general duties of submission to authority, of decency and order, of respecting precedents long established,—instead of appealing to that warrant which marks us *exclusively* for GOD’S AM-BASSADORS.”—No. iv. p. 1.

Thus we see that, at the very outset of their publication, the tract writers are careful to inculcate this idea of the existence of a succession from the Apostles in the hierarchy of the Anglican Church, and of a consequent obligation on the part of the laity to pay it submission and obedience. But the tract No. 15 is entitled, “ On the Apostolical Succession in the English Church.” It treats of the popular objection (and a well-grounded objection we could easily prove it), that in assuming this privilege of apostolic succession, and its consequent rights, High-Churchmen must recur to Rome as the fountain-head of their orders, which is inconsistent in men that reprobate “ Popery.” It proceeds to answer this objection, and then to give the grounds whereon the Church of England lays claim to the succession. As this tract will form the principal text whereupon we shall comment through this article, we will reserve our extracts for each part of our subject as we shall want them. In the meantime, we will refer our readers for farther evidence, if required, of this determination in the Oxford divines to claim all the rights of a Church legally descended from the Apostles, to the tracts No. 5, p. 1, and 7, entitled, “ The Episcopal Church Apostolical,” to which, likewise, we may have occasion to refer.

It is our intention to discuss the question between us and the Anglican upon this subject, independently of all inquiry into the validity of their ordinations. And this determination is the result of much serious reflection. Before stating our reasons, however, we must be allowed to protect ourselves against any misrepresentation. Let it not for a moment be imagined, that in thus waiving the inquiry into the value of English ordinations, we are prepared to admit their validity. On the contrary, our sincere and earnest conviction is, that, independent of all historical

questions, they are decidedly invalid and nothing worth. We do not, therefore, sacrifice one inch of 'vantage ground to our opponents, when we agree to put aside, in this inquiry into their pretensions to apostolical descent and jurisdiction, the question of the validity of their ordinations. It is only for the following reasons that we do so :—

First, The question of fact regarding the first Anglican consecration has lately been matter of controversy between several Catholic writers; and those of no mean reputation on either side. We wish not at present to revive the dispute. But neither do we wish to combat with arguments, the validity of which might be questioned by some of our side. Secondly, the two inquiries, if united, would be very long; and, as each can be conducted independently of the other, we must choose one which most directly meets the theories of our adversaries. Thirdly, the ground will be more completely cut away from under their feet, if we prove that, even granting them, for argument's sake, that their ordinations are valid, or were at the beginning, still they have not, nor ever had, any part in the apostolical succession, but are a schismatical Church in the fullest sense of the word; so that the works of their ministry are wholly unprofitable, and their jurisdiction none. Such are our motives for dispensing ourselves at once from entering upon the question of English orders.

In the passages above quoted, and in all others which treat of this subject in our authors, it is assumed that ordination or imposition of hands, transmits at once apostolical jurisdiction. It is considered sufficient, to admit that the bishops of the establishment have been validly consecrated, to conclude thence that they are possessed of authority in their respective sees. Let the reader peruse the seventh tract, where he will find the simple fact of succession in a see through lawful consecration, alleged as a sufficient ground for admitting the transmission of the apostolic succession. We shall, therefore, have to inquire into two points. First, does consecration, even though valid, confer jurisdiction; secondly, what will vitiate the episcopacy of a see or province, or kingdom, so as to cut it off from all participation in the rights of apostolical succession and jurisdiction. As the divines with whom at present we deal possess the greatest respect for ecclesiastical antiquity, and, in fact, agree with us that it is the judge of appeal upon such questions as the present, whereon Scripture has left us no canon or rule, we shall make it the test of their pretensions, and judge their Church as we are conscientiously convinced it would have been judged by the fathers and councils of the first centuries.

The distinction between ordination and jurisdiction is so clearly expressed in ancient ecclesiastical regulations, that men as conversant in them as the Oxford divines cannot have overlooked it. For we read of bishops, acknowledged as such, who yet were not allowed to exercise any act of episcopal authority, not even to ordain. The council of Ephesus mentions bishops who had no Churches nor any settled see; it calls them ἀπολίδες σχολαζοντες, και εκκλησιας μη εχοντες.* When Eustathius, Metropolitan of Pamphylia, had renounced his bishopric, and another had been elected in his place, it was referred to the same synod what was to be done with him; and the fathers decided as follows:—"We define it to be right and proper, that, without any contradiction, he retain the name and honour and communion of a bishop; but on condition that he neither have the authority of ordaining, nor offer up sacrifice in any Church by his own right; unless, for the sake of his assistance, or by way of concession through Christian love, some brother and fellow-bishop kindly permit him."†

Sozomen mentions, "Barses and Eulogius (monks), who afterwards were both bishops, not of any city, but for honour only, consecrated in their monastery to reward their good actions. In which manner also," he adds, "Lazarus, of whom I have spoken above, was also a bishop."‡ It is no doubt true, that, in general, the Church did not approve of the appointment of bishops without a see,—a practice condemned by the council of Sardica. Still they were allowed to be bishops void of jurisdiction. In the conferences of Carthage (*Collatio Carthaginensis*), Petilianus the Donatist calls such bishops phantoms (*imagines*), as opposed to real bishops (*Cardinales, et authenticos episcopos*).§ The thirty-seventh canon of the Trullan Synod allowed bishops whose sees were in the hands of barbarians or others, and therefore inaccessible, to ordain and discharge all other episcopal functions. In commenting upon this canon, Zonaras observes, that there were other bishops, who, out of mere sloth or love of ease, would not reside, nor undergo the episcopal burden, yet retained the honour and character of bishops.|| The cases of Meletius and of the Donatist bishops confirm the same point of ancient ecclesiastical doctrine. Of the latter, we shall have to mention the case later. The former is as follows:—Meletius, Bishop of Lycopolis, deposed by St. Peter of Alexandria, went

* In Relat. ad Cœlestin. Labb. tom. iii. col. 664.

† Ibid. col. 805.

‡ H. E. lib. vi. cap. 34.

§ Ad calcem Oper. S. Optati, p. 277. ed. Dupin. See also Christian Lupus Ven. 1724, tom. ii. p. 73.

// Apud Thomassinum, "Vetus et nova Ecclesiæ Disciplina," t. i. p. 97.

from place to place consecrating bishops, under pretence that he was vicar to the patriarch of Antioch. The council of Nicea took cognizance of the matter. It acknowledged the validity of the imposition of hands, but denied jurisdiction or place in the apostolical succession to such as had thus received it. It, however, sanctioned that, upon the death of any legitimate bishop, one of those consecrated by Meletius might succeed, provided he were chosen by the people, and found qualified and approved by the patriarch of Alexandria; in other words, if to the valid but illegal consecration the institution required by the ecclesiastical law was added.* And speaking of the decrees of this great council, we must not omit the eighth canon, which regards the Cathari, or Novatians. It enacts, that upon renouncing their errors, they shall be reconciled to the Church, and allowed to remain among the clergy. Where one of the bishops returns, the Catholic bishop shall retain his authority, and the other either retain the title, though exercising the functions of a simple presbyter; or should the bishop not approve of having him with him, he must provide for him a place as chorepiscopus or as priest. But two bishops must not be in one city.† It is not necessary to delay our readers with evidence that, on the other hand, episcopal jurisdiction was exercised by simple presbyters in former times, when deputed by proper authority, though, of course, they did not ordain nor perform other offices requiring the episcopal character.‡ But what we have said is amply sufficient to prove that the reasoning of the new divines is completely false, when they go about to persuade men that if their bishops were truly consecrated by imposition of hands, they became inheritors of apostolical jurisdiction. For in all the instances above given, and in others that will later come under discussion, there was no question about the validity of the episcopal consecration, or the absolute power of the consecrators to confer orders; yet, still, it was denied to those consecrated by them to exercise any acts of power, except by the accession of some new sanction. And this, as in the case of Eustathius, was not a deprivation, nor in punishment of crime, nor even from illegality in preceding acts, but from a clear sense that one portion of the episcopal office did not necessarily include the other. The tract-writers constantly mix up the power of validly consecrating the Eucharist with that of instructing or governing (No. xv. p. 2; No. iv. p. 2); which is quite at variance with

* *Epistola Conc. Nicæni ad Eccles. Alex. apud Labbæum, tom. ii. col. 251.*

† *Ibid. col. 32.*

‡ See Bolgeni, "*L'Episcopato ossia della potestà di governar la Chiesa.*" Rome, 1789, pp. 151 seqq.

ancient doctrine and practice. Supposing, therefore, that Barlow and the others consecrated Parker, and that all was validly done as to matter and form, it does not follow that he, or those who became seized of other episcopal sees in England and Ireland, and received a similar consecration, were the lawful holders thereof, or the legitimate successors of their first bishops. It may be a case like that of the Meletian bishops, or others of which we shall speak.

Thus far we have been engaged with our first enquiry, which in fact is only a preliminary to the second. We have seen that, in the ancient Church, consecration was not considered to confer necessarily the jurisdiction attached to apostolical succession. Our second enquiry is, "what will vitiate the episcopacy of a see, a province, or kingdom, so as to cut it off from all participation in the rights of apostolical succession and jurisdiction?"

We have seen the case of the Novatians treated in the eighth canon of Nicea, and the decree regarding them is extremely valuable, as embodying principles acted upon most rigidly in the ancient Church. From it we are necessarily led to the conclusion that "any appointment to a bishoprick, even by valid consecration, which is at variance with the canons actually in force in the Church, is unlawful, and leaves the bishop so appointed void of all jurisdiction and power; so that he is a usurper if he take possession of a see."

Novatian himself was without doubt validly consecrated by those real bishops; who are said by St. Cornelius to have performed the ceremony while in a state of intoxication, and not aware of what they were about.* He thus set himself up against Pope Cornelius, whose ordination he denied, and claimed the see of Rome. But all his acts were considered invalid, and the fathers go so far as to declare that his episcopacy was null, and that he was not consecrated.† St. Pacian, however, draws the exact line of distinction, when he calls him, "*sine consecratione legitima episcopum factum adeoque nec factum.*‡ The bare fact, therefore of his being duly consecrated a bishop was not sufficient, because he had not been lawfully constituted such.

The Council of Nicea made the following canon. "This is generally manifest, that if any one shall have been made bishop

* Epist. ad Fabium Alexand. ap. Euseb. H. E. lib. vi. cap. 43 ed. Valesii. The three bishops seem to have expressly consecrated Novatian to the See of Rome.

† The Council of Alexandria, Anno 339, says he is no bishop. Labbe, tom. ii. col. 542. St. Cyprian reckons him among those "qui nemine episcopatum dante, episcopi sibi nomen assumunt."

‡ Epist. ii. ad Sympronianum. He likewise describes him as one "*quem consecrante nullo linteata sedes accepit.*"

without the consent of his Metropolitan, the general council defines that he ought to be no bishop.”* Pope Innocent I renewed the decree of Pope Siricius, “*ut extra conscientiam metropolitani episcopi nullus audeat ordinare episcopum.*† St. Leo the Great writes more explicitly, that such are not to be considered bishops, “who are neither chosen by the clergy, nor desired by the people, nor consecrated by the bishops of the province, with authority of the Metropolitan.”‡ And Pope Hilarus, speaking of the consecration of Mamertus contrary to the canons, leaves it, after severe reproof, to the Metropolitan to decide whether or no he shall act as a bishop.§

In these and other instances, as Bolgeni remarks, there is no question of removing or deposing, but such bishops were not supposed to have ever possessed any jurisdiction from the beginning, and consequently were not considered to be partakers of the apostolical authority transmitted by *legitimate* succession.|| Nor is this a mere inference of others, or his, but is borne out by the express testimony of ancient fathers, who clearly state that such nullity of episcopal nomination was the necessary consequence of violation of the canons in force. St. Leo, referring to the Nicene canons, says, “*infirmum atque irritum erit, quidquid à predictorum Patrum Canonibus discreparit.*”¶ St. Athanasius speaks of Gregory, who was intruded into the see of Alexandria in like manner; but we shall have to quote the passage later.

An important question meets us here, and one which the reasoning of the *Tracts for the Times* throws in our way. Do the canons, the infringement of which invalidate as far as jurisdiction goes episcopal consecration, form a fixed code? in other words, was it only the violation of the Nicene decree that produced this effect, or the simple departure from the rules in force at any given time, such rules being variable? We say that the *Tracts for the Times* oblige us to discuss this question here, though perhaps prematurely. For to vindicate the English Church from the accusation of schism, it quotes a decree of the council at Ephesus, which having secured the liberties of the Church of Cyprus from the usurpations of the Antiochian patriarch, generalizes its principles and orders, that *the rights of*

* Can. vi. ap. Labbe, tom. ii. col. 41.

† Epist. ii. ad. Vict. Rothomag. cap. iii. ap. Const. Epist. Rom. Pont. tom. i col. 696.

‡ Epist. clxvii. ad. Rustic. Narbon.

§ Epist. xi. ap. Labb. tom. iv. col. 1046.

|| Ubi supra, p. 168.

¶ Epist. cxiv. ad lxxxviii ad Synod. Chalced.

every province should be preserved pure and inviolate, which have always belonged to it, according to the usage which has always obtained." These words are thus emphatically printed by the writer, who proceeds to comment upon the canon as follows:—

"Here we have a remarkable parallel to the dispute between Rome and us; and we see what was the decision of the general Church upon it. It will be observed, the decree is passed *for all provinces in all future times*, as well as for the immediate exigency. Now this is a plain refutation of the Romanists on their own principles. They profess to hold the canons of the primitive Church; the very line they take is to declare the Church to be one and the same in all ages. Here then they witness against themselves. The Pope *has* encroached on the rights of other Churches, and violated the canon above cited. Herein is the difference between his relation to us, and that of any civil ruler, whose power was in its origin illegally acquired. Doubtless we are bound to obey the monarch under whom we are born, even though his ancestor were an usurper. Time legitimizes a conquest. But this is not the case in spiritual matters. The Church goes by *fixed laws*; and this usurpation has all along been counter to one of her acknowledged standing ordinances, founded on reasons of universal application."—vol. i. No. xv. p. 8.

How far this canon will serve the writer's turn will in the sequel perhaps appear. At present we only wish to meet the false assertions upon which his argument is based. First. We would ask him, for it is more his affair than ours, does he or his Church hold that this decree is unalterable, or that the Church which made that canon may not vary its discipline at different times? If he allow that it may, then does this decree, securing to each province in perpetuity whatever rights it then possessed, prove nothing. If he maintain against us, as he seems to do, that the Church goes by *fixed laws*, and that no circumstance can sanction a variation in them, then we call upon him to be consistent, and take in the same invariable sense other canons of councils respecting bishops. Thus the general council of Nicea, in its fifteenth canon, expressly enacts that "no bishop, priest, or deacon, be translated from one city or see to another;" and that, "if after the definition of this holy and great synod any one shall attempt to make such translation, it shall be considered null and void, and the person must be restored to the Church for which he was originally ordained bishop, priest, or deacon."* Does the Anglican Church stand by this canon? Does the writer consider his Grace of Canterbury

* Ap. Labbe, tom. ii. col. St. Jerome gives us the motives of this canon, *the desire of bishops to pass from poor to rich sees*. "In Nicæna Synodo a Patribus est decretum, ne de alia ad aliam Ecclesiam Episcopus transferatur: ne virginalis pauperculæ societate contempta, ditionis adulteræ quærat amplexus." Epist. lxxxiii ad Ocean. The fathers often represent churches as the spouses of bishops, whose unions cannot be dissolved.

and Charles James of London unlawfully possessed of their sees, and their authority void, because, in the face of this canon of a general council, translated from other sees? Yet in it we find the very qualification on which the author lays so much stress on that of Ephesus, that it regards the future; and as the Church is governed by *fixed laws*, they hold as yet. And, moreover, this canon was renewed and enforced by the Council of Chalcedon in its fifth canon.* In like manner, the sixteenth canon of Nicea forbids the clergy to abandon their churches, that is, not to reside; and the seventeenth orders the deposition of all such as place their money at interest. Does the English hierarchy admit either of these canons to be binding?

The writer could not, surely, be serious when he maintained the unalterable nature of canons that regarded the rights of sees to independence; still less when he urged this maxim as maintained by Catholics. It is true that writing for the laity, and consequently giving no references, such extracts with such a gloss will blind and perhaps captivate obedience; but one versed in antiquity could hardly have been ignorant that even such usurpations as the Council of Ephesus condemns, may become so established as to pass into laws, and be sanctioned by canons. If he be acquainted with the history of the see of Constantinople, he would have remembered how that see, originally a suffragan of Heraclea, by a series of usurpations, obtained jurisdiction over the Metropolitans of Pontus, Thrace, and Asia, which at length was approved by the general council of Chalcedon. And though, through the refusal of Pope Leo to sanction some of the canons of that synod, the arrogant pretensions of that see against the rights of other patriarchates were repressed, yet it is evident that its jurisdiction as a Patriarchal See over the once *autocephali*, or independent metropolitans above-named, was from thenceforward admitted.†

But if on the one hand the reasoning of the tract-writer be delusive and incorrect, when he argues from any general assertion of rights in an ancient though œcumenical council, that such rights are unalienable (of the particular application of this case to England we shall treat later) we on the other hand are justified in concluding from this example that any jurisdiction, even though it might have been originally unjust and usurped, which any patriarchate obtained, might, by long usage and willing submission, become legitimated, and so form a part of the

* Ap. Labbe, tom. iii. col. 757.

† Thomassin, tom. i. p. 38. It must be observed too that the independence of Ephesus (metropolis of Asia) was attributed to its having been the see of John, and consequently was as old as the Church.

ecclesiastical law. For the council of Chalcedon does not *grant* but *admit* rights as already existing: "let not the privileges of Constantinople be lost." But if we search this important matter closer, for it brings us very near our final purpose, we shall come to still more specific conclusions. For both from the instance just given and from the very one quoted from the Tracts, it clearly follows that the subjection to or exemption from jurisdiction, so completely depended upon consuetude and the actual and tolerated exercise of power, that this acquired the force of canon law. For when the legates of the Holy See had protested against the subscriptions which they thought had been artfully extorted from the Pontic and Asiatic bishops during their absence from the synod, and insisted that the very canon of Nicea, quoted by the Tracts,* should here prevail, as securing to these Churches their independence, the fathers required that all who had signed the decrees in question, should say whether they had been compelled to subscribe, or had done it of their own free will. In answering to this appeal, several of the bishops assign as their grounds for subjection to the patriarchal rights of Constantinople, that custom had sanctioned it. Thus Seleucus, bishop of Amasia, says, "before me three bishops were consecrated by this see, and finding this series, I followed it. And now I have made it (the subscription) voluntarily, wishing to be under this see." Peter of Gangræ said, "before me three were consecrated by the bishop of the imperial city, and I likewise after them. Therefore I have consented having custom for it." Marinianus of Synnadi and Critænianus of Aphrodisia give the same reason. Eusebius of Dorylœum assigns as his motive that the Pope had approved of this practice in presence of some Constantinopolitan clergy. His words deserve to be quoted: "Ἐκὼν ὑπεγραψα, ἐπειδὴ καὶ ΤΟΝ ΚΑΝΟΝΑ ΤΟΥΤΟΝ τῷ ἁγιωτάτῳ πάπῃ ἐν Ῥώμῃ ἐγὼ ἀνεγνων, παρόντων τῶν κληρικῶν Κωνσταντινουπόλεως, καὶ ἀπεδέξατο αὐτόν. Eleutherius of Chalcedon said that the See of Constantinople held its superior authority by the canons and custom.† Now certainly the canons of Nicea and Ephesus denied this assumption, and thus we find the establishment of custom prevailing in the minds of these bishops against them, and the general council acquiescing in their opinion. For the claims of Constantinople were held good, and ever after prevailed. Indeed the

* *Ubi supra.*

† Ap. Labbe, tom. iv. col. 813-815. In fact the only canons recited as bearing upon the point were that of Nicea securing the rights of Churches, and one of the synod of Constantinople, under Nestorius, which expressly acknowledges the *αυτοκεφαλία* of Pontus, Asia, and Thrace. These certainly could not be the *canons* alluded to, and yet no other canon, properly so called, could be supposed to bear upon the point.—*Ubi supra*, col. 811.

canon mentioned by Eusebius of Dorylœum could mean no more than the *rule* introduced by custom, which had thus acquired canonical authority.

The instance quoted by the tracts is still more to our purpose. The Patriarch of Antioch claimed the right of ordaining the bishops of Cyprus, or of authorizing their ordination. These oppose his pretensions and appeal to the council of Ephesus. The fathers there assembled prudently investigate the patriarch's right to interference, which they do as follows. The holy synod said, "What does the Bishop of Antioch wish?"—Evagrius of Sola, "He attempts to subject our island, and seize the right of ordaining, contrary to the *canons and custom which is now ancient.*" The holy synod, "Was the Bishop of Antioch ever known to consecrate a bishop in Constantia?"—Zeno of Curcium, "*From the apostles' time it cannot be shewn that the Patriarch of Antioch was present and ordained, OR EVER COMMUNICATED TO THE ISLAND THE GRACE OF ORDERS, nor yet any one else.*" The holy synod, "Let the holy synod remember the canon of the holy fathers, in Nicea assembled, which secures to each Church its *pristine dignity* . . . inform us, therefore, HAD NOT THE BISHOP OF ANTIOCH THE RIGHT OF ORDAINING YOU FROM ANCIENT CUSTOM?"—Zeno said, "We have already affirmed that he never was present nor ordained either in the metropolis or in any other city."* After this interrogatory comes the decree given in the Tract.†

Any unprejudiced reader, upon perusing this interrogatory, would we think conclude that, had the Cyprian bishops been unable to state, that till then the Antiochian patriarch had not ordained bishops in their island, such a decree would not have been granted. Twice the synod insists upon an explicit answer to this question, not to ascertain what right the patriarch put forward, nor how he supported it, but simply to learn whether or no an ancient custom prevailed, of the bishops of Antioch exerting patriarchal rights over the nomination of the Cyprian prelates. Moreover, canons and customs become ancient are put on a level, and the latter receive the same force as the former. The preamble to the decree, as given in the tracts, confirms all that we have said: for it says, "*whereas it is against ancient usage that the Bishop of Antioch should ordain in Cyprus*, as has been proved to us in this council, both in words and in writing, by most orthodox men, we THEREFORE decree that the prelates of the Cyprian Churches shall be suffered without let or hindrance to consecrate bishops by themselves, and, moreover, that the same

* *Ib.* tom. iii. col. 800.† *Ib.* col. 801.

rule shall be observed also in other dioceses and provinces everywhere, so that no bishop shall interfere in another province, WHICH HAS NOT FROM THE VERY FIRST BEEN UNDER HIMSELF AND HIS PREDECESSORS." Is it not evident that the decree supposes that no patriarchal jurisdiction had existed *de facto* in that island; nay, that it sanctions the principle, that where such exercise of jurisdiction exists it has the force of law?

The examples and authorities thus far recited, lead us to these conclusions. First, the Church has, from the beginning, held that a bishop, however validly consecrated, if placed in possession of a see contrary to the canons actually in force in the Church, or by means contrary to those regulations which it considers essential to legitimate nomination, acquired no jurisdiction in or over it, and did not enjoy a part in that apostolical succession, which can only be transmitted through legitimate occupation. Secondly, that the canons appointing the forms of such legitimate occupation, or the bars thereto, were not particularly those of Nicea, but generally such as the Church agreed in at a given time. Thirdly, that patriarchal jurisdiction is legitimated and determined by usage, and that this sanctions it with a force equal to that of canons.

Let us now come to the practical application of these principles to the case of English and Irish hierarchy. Our readers will have seen what liberal terms we have granted our adversaries, in this dispute. Till now, we have allowed them to assume what we could have justly denied,—the validity of their orders. We are going to extend our concessions farther still, *for the present*. For we are going to confine the rights of the sovereign Pontiff in England to those of his patriarchate, excluding the consideration of his supremacy, to which we shall revert later. Nay, we are not unwilling even to go farther still; and, if the inquiry could be thereby shortened, we would allow our antagonists the false plea of original usurpation on his part. For the cases of Constantinople, in the matter of Thrace, Pontus and Asia, and of Cyprus *versus* Antioch, have established the principle, that possession and ancient usage constitute a right to patriarchal jurisdiction,—all inquiry into its origin being waived.

Let us, therefore, suppose a general council having to decide by those *fixed laws* to which the Tracts appeal, upon the value of Anglican jurisdiction in the sees of England, and the right of the royal or parliamentary bishops to apostolical succession, denied to them by the See of Rome. Let the inquiry be conducted on the principles and in the forms used in the ancient synods, as Ephesus or Chalcedon. It might be as follows:—

THE ACCUSATION. "The apostolic see charges these who

call themselves the archbishops and bishops of the Church established in England and Ireland, with being intruders, by favour of the civil power, into the sees of those realms; inasmuch as they and their predecessors took possession thereof in spite, and to the detriment, of the patriarchal rights of that see, which, from the canons and immemorial usage, had been exercised in the nomination or approbation of all metropolitans and bishops. Up to the time of King Henry VIII, this right was perfectly acquiesced in; when, by his statute 25 Hen. VIII, c. 20, the nomination was reserved by letters missive to the king, all the authority of the apostolic see being set aside. The bishops so ordained were removed by the authority of Queen Mary, as competent to interfere in such matters as the king her father. But, moreover, what she did was with the full concurrence and approbation of this apostolic see, which reclaimed and resumed its rights, as before acknowledged, and, therefore, was in exact conformity to ecclesiastical law. After which, Elizabeth expelled the bishops who were in peaceable possession of their sees, with the consent of the Holy See and of the Crown; and so substituted, by her own private authority, other so-called bishops, from whom the present pretenders to apostolical succession follow and succeed.* Such subversion of the rights long holden and admitted of this apostolical see, and such assumption of a power never admitted in any part of the Church, were clear infringements of the canon, and constitute an act of usurpation and intrusion, which is null and void in all its consequences."

THE REJOINDER. "The archbishops and bishops of England and Ireland, reply to this charge, by denying that the Bishop of Rome, although he was 'the first of the patriarchs in dignity,' and 'might be called the honorary primate of all Christendom,' possessed any lawful jurisdiction in their countries. For we say, that in Scripture there is not a word to sanction the assumption on his part, of such authority as he exercised for

* Whoever will take the trouble of running through Godwin's "*De præsulibus Anglicanis*," see by see, will find the following results. Succeeded by royal appointment to sees vacant, the Archbishop of Canterbury, bishops of Salisbury, Norwich, Chichester, Gloucester, Bristol, Bangor, Hereford,—eight. Succeeded by the expulsion of bishops in pacific and legal possession, never having before held the sees to which they were preferred, Archbishop of York, bishops of London, Winchester, Ely, Lincoln, Lichfield and Coventry, Bath and Wells, Exeter, Worcester, Rochester, St. David's, St. Asaph's, Durham, Peterborough, Carlisle, Chester,—sixteen. Retained in the see he occupied, Bishop of Llandaff (*Fundi nostri calamitas*, Godw.),—one. Barlow, deposed from Bath and Wells, under Mary, was named Bishop of Chichester; and Scorey, formerly of Chichester, received Hereford: as if to disprove the bold assertion of the Tracts, that, on the succession of Queen Elizabeth, the true successors of the Apostles in the English Church, were reinstated in their rights!—(Tr. xv. p. 4.) Not a single bishop was reinstated in a see of which he had been deprived. Compare Dodd, vol. ii. p. 7.

so many ages.* Hence, at the Reformation, “there was no new Church founded amongst us, but *the rights* and the doctrines of the ancient existing Church were asserted and re-established. In proof of this, we need only look at the history of the times. In the year 1534, the bishops and clergy of England assembled in their respective convocations of Canterbury and York, and signed a declaration, that the Pope, or Bishop of Rome, had no more jurisdiction in this country, by the Word of God, than any other foreign bishop.”†

THE LAW AND PRECEDENTS. “We do not recollect a single instance in an Œcumenical Synod, where the decision as to the rights of the Patriarch of Antioch or Alexandria, to exercise jurisdiction over bishops of other countries,—as of Lybia, Pentapolis, or Cyprus,—and to confirm or depose them, was based upon the inquiry whether he had more jurisdiction *by the Word of God*, than any other foreign bishop.” But we have found it to be the prevailing practice, when appeal was made to general councils in matters of disputed rights (as our tract-writers here have made), for the fathers, before proceeding to examine the question of fact, to desire those canons and precedents to be recited which could establish the rights of parties in the case before them. We might, therefore, reasonably suppose such to be the proceeding here. The καθωσιωμένος μαγιστριανός καὶ σηκηρητάριος τοῦ θείου κορονιστωρίου‡ might be supposed to read as follows:—

1. “The decrees of the Great and Holy Councils. The celebrated rule of the First Nicene Council, A. D. 325. *Let the ancient usages prevail* which are received in Egypt, &c., *as they are observed in the case of the Bishop of Rome.*” (Tr. *ibid.* p. 8.)§

* There is an accountable inconsistency in the appeal made by the tract-writer to ecclesiastical decisions, while the original separation from the Holy See proceeded exclusively on the grounds which he also lays down, that *Scripture* gives to the Bishop of Rome no more authority in England than it does to any other foreign bishop. The act of convocation of the province of Canterbury in 1534, the opinion of the University of Cambridge, and the king’s proclamation abolishing the supremacy, omit all mention of ecclesiastical usage, and only discuss the question of divine right as granted in Scripture. Wilkins’ Concilia, 1738, tom. iii. pp. 769, 771, 772. Are these the grounds on which Ephesus or Chalcedon would have conducted the inquiry?

† It is lamentable to hear such men as compose these Tracts, admitting as free, deliberate acts of the clergy, what they tremblingly performed by King Henry’s stern command, with the fate of Fisher and More as the alternative of refusal, what formed the sequel of a series of measures taken by the tyrant to secure possession of the object of his lust, and what the most influential members of those convocations, including the royal pander Cranmer himself, afterwards retracted.

‡ So the secretary is styled in the acts of the council.

§ On the interpretation of this canon, see De la Mennais, “Tradition de l’Eglise sur l’institution des évêques,” Liège, 1814, vol. ii. pp. 81 seqq.; the work by which alone it were well if its author could be known to posterity.

The decree of Ephesus. "The same rule shall be observed also in other dioceses and provinces every where, so that no bishop shall interfere in other provinces, *which has not from the very first been under himself and his predecessors.*"—*ib.* p. 7.

2. Proofs of the rights of Patriarchs to ordain and confirm the Metropolitans, and through them all the bishops of their patriarchate. St. Athanasius of Alexandria expressly tells us, that he exercised this right by ordaining many bishops.* The Council of Nicea expressly enjoined that for any of the Melitian bishops to be raised to a see, it was necessary to have canonical election by the clergy and people, and the confirmation of the Patriarch of Alexandria.† The general Council of Chalcedon decreed that the Patriarch of Constantinople should have the power of consecrating the metropolitans of Pontus and Asia.‡ The celebrated epistle of Pope Innocent I to Alexander, Patriarch of Antioch, explains the canon of Nicea as admitting this right in patriarchs. "Whence we remark," he writes, "that this (patriarchal dignity) was given to Antioch not so much on account of the magnificence of the city, as because it is proved to have been the first see of the first Apostle, where the Christian religion received its name, and was worthy of having a celebrated meeting of the Apostles; and which would not be second to the See of Rome, but that it only enjoyed temporarily (*in transitu*) what this had the happiness to receive and fully to possess. Therefore, beloved brother, we think, that as, by peculiar authority, you ordain all metropolitans, so you should not allow other bishops to be appointed without your permission and approbation. On which matter this will be the proper course for you to take, that you should by letters authorise such as are at a great distance to be ordained by those who now do it by their own judgment, and those who are near, if you think right, you should bring to receive consecration at your own hands."§ This decree or letter assumes for its foundation the fact that the patriarch consecrated metropolitans in his jurisdiction.

3. Proofs that the nomination of bishops without the sanction of their respective patriarchs were null as to jurisdiction. Hitherto we have contented ourselves with concluding that the infringement of the canon law invalidated the legitimacy of consecration. Direct proofs are not wanting to show that the want of the patriarch's assent produced a fatal flaw in the title to a see. Synesius writes that the ordination of the bishops of Palœleisca

* Epist. ad Dracont. ap Hallier. de Sacris Ordin. Paris, 1636, p. 771.

† Epist. Conc. Nic. ad Eccles. Alex. Labbe, tom. ii. col. 251.

‡ Can. 28, *ib.* tom. iv. col. 769.

§ Epist. Innoc. I ad Alex. ap. Coustant. Epist. R. P. col. 851.

and Hydrax were invalid, because they had not been confirmed by the Patriarch of Alexandria.* Again, when the people of Olbium had elected a bishop, and three prelates, of whom Synesius was one, had given their assent, he writes to the patriarch that only his approbation was wanting to complete the work.† In fine, to omit many other proofs, the eighth general council, the fourth of Constantinople, having recited the canon of Nicea, orders that *the ancient custom* be preserved whereby the *Patriarchs of Rome, Antioch, and Jerusalem* might summon to council, or visit and correct *all metropolitans who are promoted by them, and whether by imposition of hands, or by gift of the pallium* RECEIVE VALIDITY IN THEIR EPISCOPAL DIGNITY.”‡

4. Proofs that the Roman pontiffs were patriarchs of the West, and exercised patriarchal rights over it, England included. St. Jerom says, “Let them condemn me as a heretic with the WEST, as a heretic WITH EGYPT, that is with Damasus (of Rome) and with Peter (of Alexandria).§ That is, as the learned and most judicious De Marca observes, the pope is placed in the same relation to the entire West as the Alexandrian patriarch is to Egypt, that is, as its patriarch;|| having therefore precisely as much right to exercise jurisdiction in the nomination of his metropolitans, and consequently any of these is without jurisdiction if uncanonically nominated against his will. When the emperor Justinian wished to honour with a high ecclesiastical dignity the Bishop of Achridus, his native place, giving it the name of *Justiniana prima*, he applied to Pope Vigilius, who erected it into an archiepiscopal and metropolitan see, assigning it a province which he took from that of Thessalonica.¶ And hence St. Gregory the Great expressly and directly confirms the nomination of John, elected to that see, sending him the pallium in token thereof.** Again, when Peregrines had been ordained bishop of Petras in 418, and the people had refused to admit him, he was elected to the *metropolitan* see of Corinth, his native city. The clergy and people sent a petition to Pope Boniface I, requesting him to

* Epist. 67 ad Theophil. ap. Morinum. Exercitat. Eccles. et Bib. p. 84.

† Ep. 76 ap. eund.

‡ After reciting the Nicene canon, “quâ pro causâ et hæc magna et sancta Synodus tam in seniori et novâ Româ quam in sede Antiochiæ ac Hierosolymorum priscam consuetudinem decernit in omnibus conservari. Ita ut earum præsules universorum Metropolitanorem qui ab ipsis promoventur et sive per manûs impositionem sive per pallii dationem episcopalis dignitatis firmitatem accipiunt, habeant potestatem, videlicet ad convocandum eos, urgente necessitate ad synodalem conventum, vel etiam ad coercendum illos et colligendum.” &c. Conc. Labbe, tom. viii. col. 1135.

§ Epist. xv. Oper. S. Hier. tom. iv. par. ii. col. 21.

|| De Concord. Sacerd. et imper. lib. i. c. v. n. 2. Tradition de l'Eglise, to. ii. p. 21.

¶ Novell. cxxx.

** Epist. xxii. Oper. S. Greg. t. ii. col. 585 ed. Bened.

confirm their choice. He first sent their memorial to his vicar, the Archbishop of Thessalonica, with orders to enquire into the case and make a report thereon. Upon receiving this, the Pope confirmed the election, in terms demonstrative that such confirmation was necessary for the validity of the appointment.* Socrates, who relates this event, says expressly that Perigines was named bishop by command of the Holy See.†

For proofs that the Pope exercised patriarchal authority over the other countries of the West, as France, Spain, Africa, and the rest, and the parts of Italy beyond the immediate province of Rome, we must refer our readers to the great writers on these points, or to the *Tradition de l'Eglise*, where they are admirably condensed.‡ We pass on to precedents more immediately connected with our enquiry.

The Church of Germany is an instance parallel to that of England, being a Church formed in a country converted to the faith by missionaries from the See of Rome. St. Boniface, its first great apostle, had received episcopal consecration from Pope Gregory II. Gregory III sent him the pallium, and empowered him to nominate and consecrate bishops "by the authority of the apostolic see."§ He did so, and divided Bavaria into four bishoprics; and having founded others in Franconia and Thuringia, he wrote to the pope for letters of confirmation for each bishop, which the pope readily sent them.||

We will content ourselves here with one single proof that England was considered a part of the Roman or Western patriarchate; others will be better introduced later. When Constantine Pogonatus wished to convene a general council, he wrote to Pope Donus requesting him to send three legates, or if those were not sufficient, as many more as he thought proper. Agatho, Donus's successor, replied, that there had been a delay in complying with the emperor's desire, from the extent of the provinces whereof his council was composed. For it must be observed that besides the papal legates, the emperor had requested a deputation consisting of about twelve metropolitans and bishops to attend the synod, as representatives of the council of Rome, that is, of the provinces more immediately subject to his jurisdiction. Now, among the subscriptions to the synod holden at Rome on this occasion, we find that of Wilfred, Archbishop of York,

* "Cui (Perigeni) ad plenitudinem confirmationis episcopatus sui hoc solum residet quod nostros in honore suo necdum suscepit affatus."—Epist. v. Bonif. I ap. Const. col. 1023.

† H. E. lib. vii. c. 36.

‡ Vol. ii. from p. 78 to the end of the volume.

§ Concil. Labbe, tom. vi. coll. 1437-1468.

|| Tradit. de l'Eglise, p. 235.

as well as of Felix of Arles and other French bishops. Moreover, in their letter to the emperor, the bishops give as a reason for delay, that they had hoped to be joined by "Theodore, Archbishop of the great island of Britain and a philosopher, together with other bishops, dwelling in that island, and divers prelates of their council dispersed in different parts, that so their suggestions might be made by their entire council."* It is an ancient maxim of ecclesiastical law, as De Marca has observed, "qui pertinent ad consecrationem, pertinent ad synodum;"† that is, only those could be summoned to a synod, over whom he who summons has right of consecration, the two rights of commanding attendance and of consecrating being commensurate. This is farther proved by the canon above cited at length of the eighth general council, (which even to those who do not allow it to be œcumenical, must have a weighty historical authority) in which it was stated that the *ancient custom*, which refers it to the decrees of the Nicene council, be observed, in virtue whereof the Patriarch of Rome, like other patriarchs, might summon the metropolitans subject to him to a council. Seeing, therefore, that Theodore of Canterbury and other English were called and expected to attend this Roman or Western Council, as forming part thereof, and that Wilfred of York being in Rome attended it, we may justly conclude that they were subject to the patriarchal authority of the Roman See, which summoned them. Such might be in an abridged form the recital of laws and precedents bearing upon the decision of the question.

THE INTERROGATORY.—In the ancient synods, the laws being read, the parties were interrogated, and of course expected to give their replies according to the truth of facts. We might, therefore, suppose such questions put as were the enquiry into the claims of the Patriarch of Antioch. The synod would interrogate, and the defenders of the Anglican Church reply.

The Synod. "Who planted the Christian religion in your country."—*The Anglican Church.* "The venerable Bede informs us, that Pope Eleutherius sent over missionaries to the Britons and converted them.‡ And when the Pelagian heresy had infected the island, Pope Celestine sent St. Germanus to correct and purify it."—*The Synod.* "Who communicated to your island the grace of orders?"§—*The Anglican Church.* "The holy pope St. Gregory, who reconverted our island under the Anglo-Saxons, and established in it the episcopacy which yet remains. For he appointed St. Augustine, Archbishop of Lon-

* Concil. Labbe, tom. vi. col. 685.

† De Concord. lib. i. c. vii. n. 3.

‡ Historia Ecclesiastica, lib. i. c. 4.

§ Conc. Chalced. sup. cit.

don (which see he transferred to Canterbury), sending him the pallium, with power to consecrate twelve bishops as his suffragans, and another at York, who should also consecrate twelve suffragans, receiving likewise the pallium, and enjoying the dignity of metropolitan. The pope also disposes, that during Augustine's lifetime, the Archbishop of York should be subject to him, but after the death of that apostle enjoy independence. The two metropolitans were to have precedence according to seniority of consecration."*—*The Synod*. "Did the Bishop of Rome continue to exercise jurisdiction over the metropolitans of England and Ireland after their first establishment?"—*The Anglican Church*. "Most certainly; for Honorius I, writing to King Edwin, sends the pallium to the two archbishops, with special powers to either to name the other's successor, *in virtue of the authority of the Holy See*, in consideration of the great distance which separates England from Rome.† Pope Adrian, acceding to the request of Offa, king of the Mercians, created the Bishop of Lichfield primate, subjecting to him many of the suffragans of Canterbury. The Archbishop of this see submitted, however reluctantly, to the dismemberment of his province, till Leo III, better informed, acceded to the petition of the bishops, and rescinded his predecessor's decree.‡ During the long contests for superiority between the sees of Canterbury and York, the matter was constantly referred to Rome, and its legates presided at the British synods held concerning their respective claims. The alternate triumphs of the contending parties were due to papal decisions in favour of one or the other.§ In Ireland it was the same. St. Malachi, Archbishop of Armagh, because, as St. Bernard writes, '*metropoliticae sedi deerat adhuc et defuerat pallii usus, quod est plenitudo honoris*,' undertook a journey to

* "Usum pallii tibi concedimus, ita ut per loca singula duodecim Episcopos ordines qui tuæ ditioni subjaceant; quatenus Londinensis civitatis episcopus semper in posterum à synodo propriâ debeat consecrari, atque honoris pallium ab hâc apostolicâ sede percipiat. Ad Eboracam verò civitatem te volumus episcopum mittere, ut ipse quoque duodecim episcopos ordinet, ut Metropolitani honore perfruatur, quia ei quoque pallium tribuere disponimus, quem tamen tuæ fraternitatis volumus dispositioni subjacere. Post obitum verò tuum ita episcopis quos ordinaverit præsit, ut Londoniensis Episcopi nullo modo ditioni subjaceat. Sit verò inter Londoniæ et Eboracæ civitatis, in posterum honoris ista distinctio, ut ipse prior habeatur, qui primus fuerit ordinatus."—Epist. lxxv. lib. xi. Oper. S. Greg. to. ii. col. 1163. Here we have a similar expression to the one mentioned above; the synod or council of a *metropolitan* is evidently the collection of the bishops whom he has the right of consecrating.

† Conc. Labbe, tom. v. col. 1683.

‡ Matt. Westm. p. 276. William of Malmesb. p. 30.

§ Those who wish to read a detailed narrative of these distressing disputes will find it in Thomassin. *Vetus et Nova Ecclesiæ Disciplina*. Par. i. lib. i. c. xxxvi. tom. i. pp. 121-126.

Rome to obtain this distinction for himself, and for another new archiepiscopal see, the erection whereof he moreover desired to have confirmed by the Holy See.* In 1151, Eugenius III sent four palliums into Ireland, appointing four metropolitans, to each of whom five suffragans were to be subject. This, says Hoveden, was an infringement of the rights of Canterbury, ‘from which the bishops of Ireland had used to ask and receive the blessing of consecration.’† We acknowledge, therefore, that the see of Rome did from the beginning order our hierarchy, such as it now exists, and transfer, divide, or otherwise vary, the jurisdiction of our metropolitans.”—*The Synod*. “Was the Bishop of Rome ever known to consecrate an Archbishop of Canterbury? Let the holy synod remember the canon of the holy fathers in Nicea assembled, which secures to *each* church its *pristine dignity* Inform us, therefore, had not the Bishop of Rome the *right* of ordaining you from ancient custom?”‡—*The Anglican Church*. “We cannot deny that the Bishop of Rome has either by himself or others ordained and confirmed our metropolitans. After St. Augustine and his immediate successors, appointed in virtue of authority from the apostolic see, other examples occur. Thus Egbert, king of Kent, and Oswi, of Northumbria, sent Wigard to Rome, as Venerable Bede informs us, to be consecrated Archbishop of Canterbury by Pope Vitalianus; but he dying at Rome, the holy pontiff named, consecrated, and sent over, Theodore, in 668.§ We have evidence also of confirmation in early times, as of Justus by Boniface V, who granted the archbishop power to consecrate other bishops,|| and of St. Dunstan, whom Pope John confirmed and appointed his vicar.¶ In later times there could be no doubt that such superior jurisdiction was exercised.”—*The Synod*. “Was such jurisdiction willingly submitted to, or was it disturbed by protests, complaints, or otherwise?”—*The Anglican Church*. “Although the clergy constantly complained of papal provisions, whereby vacant benefices were filled up by the Court of Rome with strangers, we never read of any denial of the pope’s authority to confirm archbishops, by sending them the pallium, or of his jurisdiction over them, or of his having a legate in England, who took precedence, and judged their decisions. Till the time of Henry VIII

* In vitâ Malachiæ ap. Baron. ad an. 1137, et Thomass. ubi supr.

† Thomass. *ibid.* p. 125. We do not stay to enquire into the truth of this statement; we quote it only as a proof of the acknowledged jurisdiction of the Roman pontiff.

‡ Conc. Chalced. *supr. cit.*

§ Bede, lib. iii. cap. 29. As we are treating this question on its lowest possible footing, we do not cite in the text the reason given by the two monarchs for wishing to have the archbishop consecrated at Rome; “quia Romana esset Catholica et apostolica ecclesia.”

|| Conc. Labbe, tom. v. col. 1658.

¶ Eadmer. *Hist. nov. lib. iv.*

the patriarchal privileges and rights of the Holy See were never impugned or disputed."

THE DECREE.—After hearing the parties a decree would have to be passed, based upon the canons and usages of the Church, as applied to the case under discussion. The preamble would have to state, "That the decrees of councils secure to each church its pristine dignity, and to the patriarchates their established jurisdiction; That ecclesiastical authority had ever held those episcopal nominations of no value towards conferring apostolical succession or place in the hierarchy which were made in contravention of the canons in force in the Church; That these canons, as established by *long usage*, gave to the Holy See the *right* of nominating or confirming the metropolitans of England; That the order of bishops now existing in England, even supposing the validity of their orders, were instituted and appointed, the bishop of Rome not only not consentient but repugnant thereto, and vehemently condemning the same, as an infringement of his immemorial rights, secured to him by the canons and customs become ancient." Therefore, the synod unless it turned its back upon all former decisions of the Church, and all its standing laws, would be obliged to decide: "That the bishops, who now hold by authority of law the sees of England, have not and never have had since the Reformation, any ecclesiastical, hierarchical, or apostolical succession, authority, or jurisdiction whatever, in matters religious or spiritual; That they are not the inheritors or successors of those who held the sees until that time; That consequently they are, in the eyes of the Church Catholic, intruders, usurpers, and illegitimate holders of the same."

Such must have been the decision of an ancient synod, had the validity of Anglican claims to apostolical succession or ecclesiastical authority, been proposed to it: and such is the judgment to which any one conversant with the principles of ecclesiastical antiquity and law, and willing to abide by them, must likewise come. Whatever pre-eminence, privilege, or jurisdiction, the civil legislature of the country can bestow upon its functionaries, and whatever, in such capacity, it may have bestowed upon the ministers of the English Church, we willingly allow and will pay them. Whether it be to frank a letter, or give probate to a will, to commit a poacher or to vote in the House of Lords, let them enjoy it, we envy and grudge them not. But believe there is benediction in their blessing more than any other man's, order or consecration in the laying on of their hands more than of a layman's, we do not and cannot, without renouncing all respect for antiquity, and all veneration for our fathers in the faith.

After our clear exposition of our motives, we shall not, of course, be suspected of having yielded too much, or placed the rights of the Holy See upon too low a ground. We have certainly given up much. We have discussed the matter as one of ecclesiastical right rather than of divine; and have shewn, that even thus, the jurisdiction and succession claimed by the tracts for their Church is null. But, in fact, it would be in our power to shew, that such rights as the apostolic see held, and yet does hold, over the episcopacy of the Church, are not of ecclesiastical origin, but belong essentially to the Chair of Peter, as granted to it by our Lord himself. This leads us to another and a much higher ground, on which to base any resistance to the pretensions of the English Church and its upholders to be an apostolical establishment, or "a branch," as they choose to call it, "of the Catholic Church:" a ground, too, which still dispenses with all inquiry into the validity of Anglican ordination. We mean, **THE STATE OF SCHISM** into which it put itself at the Reformation, and which at once acted as a blight upon all its ecclesiastical powers, withering them, and rendering them incapable of any act of valid jurisdiction, or any place in the apostolical succession. This portion of our argument, with many other matters connected with this subject, we reserve for our third article upon the Tracts. We shall treat it by the light of ecclesiastical antiquity, and exhibit instances curiously parallel with that of the Anglo-Hibernian establishment.

But there is an argument, or objection, or insinuation, in the tract so often alluded to, that calls for our notice before concluding this portion of our task. It consists in the remark quoted above, that the bishops appointed by Mary were usurpers, and that, "on the succession of Queen Elizabeth, the true successors of the Apostles in the English Church were reinstated in their rights." As we are in our granting vein to-day, we are disposed, for argument's sake, to suppose that the bishops put into the English sees under Mary *were* intruded, though the canons in force in the Church and in England, till Henry violated them, were observed in their appointment. And even so we ask, **WHO** deposed them? **WHO** reinstated the others? **WHO** *were* reinstated? for these are matters requiring ample explanation, before any but the rude and simple will acquiesce in the assertion of the writer. Who removed Mary's, or rather the Roman Pontiff's, bishops? Did the English Church? Who formed this Church if the sixteen deposed bishops did not? But what act was there that could be called an act of the English Church, removing one archbishop and fifteen bishops, leaving *one* in his see, omitting another (Coverdale) who had been deposed by

Mary, and placing *two* others in sees which they had not before occupied? Parker, the new metropolitan, could not be said to reinstate, nor to form the hierarchy, not being himself consecrated. And if, as these writers pretend, at the Reformation a return was made to the ancient rules, and the Anglican Church only vindicated its rights as accorded to every Church by the early councils, let them shew us the canons whereby the deprivation of bishops, and the appointment of new ones by letters missive, are granted to the civil rulers. But we will easily shew them those whereby the election of a metropolitan is reserved to his synod or provincials; and we will prove to them that it was a mutual understanding between the Holy See and temporal princes, which granted to the latter, in modern times, the power of nomination, subject to confirmation from the former. Let them be, therefore, consistent. If they allow the authority of Elizabeth to act as she did, let them admit that of Mary to act similarly: and, moreover, let them give us their warrant for such authority, in the ancient Church to which they appeal. If they consider it to have been a usurpation in Elizabeth “of the iron hand and of the iron maw,” as some of them have called her, then is their entire hierarchy based upon an unjustifiable and tyrannical act of power, and they who compose it are intruders. They are *not* shepherds who enter in by the door. It is precisely the case of Gregory, whom the Emperor Constantius thrust into the see of Alexandria, the true bishop yet living; of whom St. Athanasius thus writes:—“His reason for thus acting was, that he was neither consecrated according to the ecclesiastical canon, nor called to be a bishop according to apostolical tradition; but sent from the palace with a military force and pomp, as though he had received a civil magistracy.”* Such, if judged by the ancient laws of the Church, and in fact, were the Anglican prelates, named contrary to apostolical tradition, ordained contrary to the canons of the Church, nominees of the palace, thrust into the sees of bishops first imprisoned and deposed by the arm of secular power, and willing to receive episcopacy as though it had been a mere civil dignity. And such, in fact, it is;—they have received but a civil magistracy. And hence the Council of Sardica pronounced Gregory to be no true bishop, deposing him from the place to which the secular arm had raised him.† We think it needless to urge our last question, Who *were* reinstated? for the answer is plain,—NOT ONE. Kitchin of Llandaff was not,—for he had never been removed.

* Epist. ad Solitar. n. 14.

† Epist. Synod. ad Eccles. Alex. ap. Labbe. tom. ii. col. 667.

Barlow and Scorey were not,—for they never took possession of the sees in which alone they could have kept up succession. Parker and the new creation were not,—for they had never been bishops nor held sees before.

But let us follow up the inquiry into the matter upon those principles which have guided us through this article,—the laws of the Church as displayed in its conduct. Bassianus having been consecrated, against his will, Bishop of Evazi, refused to proceed thither. Upon a vacancy in the see of his native city, Ephesus, he violently thrust himself into it, and kept peaceable possession of it for four years. After this period, Stephanus, a priest of the same Church, assisted by a party, seized his person, and was elected bishop in his place, to all appearance by the consent of the province. The case between these two claimants for the metropolitan see, was heard and decided by the Council of Chalcedon in its eleventh action. Bassianus was charged with irregularity in having been translated from his former see. He replied, that he had never been lawfully appointed, and had never gone to it; and that Basil, successor to Memnon, who had violently consecrated him bishop, had recognized the illegality of the act, and restored him “the place and communion of a bishop:”* another proof of episcopal rank without jurisdiction. He was then called on to state who gave him possession of his see. He acknowledged that only one bishop of the province was there; who, however, when appealed to, stated that he was compelled by a mob to give him institution. Here was a manifest irregularity, sufficient to vitiate the appointment, as he himself acknowledged. However, he had interposed a plea that he had been acknowledged and confirmed by Proclus, Patriarch of Constantinople. The judges ask the Constantinopolitan clergy there present, to inform the council if this were true. Theophilus, one of them, replied that it was, and that Proclus had communicated with Bassianus as Bishop of Ephesus. The tables now seemed turned; and Stephanus was called on to prove how Bassianus had been removed (*ἀποκινήθῃντα*). We see, therefore, that the confirmation by the patriarch had the force of canonical institution, and even compensated irregularities and violations of the canons in the election. What authority, then, was greater even than this, and could reverse its decisions? *That of the Roman Pontiff.* Stephanus thus replies:—“The matter was referred to the Patriarch of Antioch by the Emperor Theodosius of blessed memory, who wrote thither. Letters were likewise brought from the most blessed Pope, the most holy Bishop of

* Conc. Labbe. tom. iv. col. 687.

Rome, that this man should not be a bishop: and the letters are evident."* This is certainly a strong proof of what we reserve for fuller demonstration in our next article, that the Holy Roman See exercised control over the decisions of patriarchs in their own jurisdictions, without demur on their parts. The sentence of the Pope was definitive, and again annulled the decision and confirmation of the patriarch.

Lucianus, Bishop of Byziæ, and some other bishops, interposed in favour of Bassianus, urging once more that his nomination had been validated by the *confirmation* of Proclus. (βεβαιῶσαι τὴν τοῦτου ἐπισκοπήν.) The answer of Stephanus was short and pithy:—"The most holy Archbishop Leo of Rome deposed him because he was made contrary to the canons."†

What was the result? That Bassianus was declared an intruder, and possessed of no right to the see of Ephesus. But was Stephanus on that account considered his lawful substitute, and allowed to retain the metropolitan chair? By no means. To have proved the person deposed a usurper, did not by any means justify his nomination, or heal any irregularities in it. Upon the motion, therefore, of the papal legates, it was decided, that neither of these should keep possession of the see; but that a new election should be proceeded to, and a pension allowed from the revenues of the bishopric for the maintenance of the two deposed bishops, who should keep the title and communion of bishops.‡ In like manner, therefore, even if the Catholic bishops nominated under Mary could be proved intruders, no argument would result in favour of the Elizabethan creation; as the link is absolutely wanting which could alone give them any claim upon succession to those who, before such imaginary intrusion, held our metropolitan and episcopal sees.

We shall, perhaps, have better occasion to see, in our next review of the tracts, how far the early Reformers felt, as well as their Catholic adversaries urged, the flaw thus established in the succession of the English Church, and the consequent vitiation of all its ecclesiastical and spiritually juridical acts. It was to prepare the way for this portion of our task, that we referred our readers, at the head of this article, to Mr. Keble's excellent edition of that best of Protestant divines, Hooker. For, in his interesting preface, we find abundant proof of the vacillating opinions of the "Fathers of the Anglican Church" upon this important point of ecclesiastical polity.

* 'ανηίνχθη παρὰ τοῦ ἐπισκόπου τῆς Ἀλεξανδρέων πόλεως, τοῦ ἐν ἁγίοις Θεοδοσίου τοῦ βασιλέως γράψαντος ἐκεῖ ἀνηνέχθη δὲ γράμματα καὶ παρὰ τοῦ μακαριωτάτου πάπα τοῦ ἐν Ῥώμῃ ἁγιωτάτου ἐπισκόπου, ὥστε τουτον μὴ δεῖν εἶναι ἐπίσκοπον καὶ φανερά ἐστι τα γράμματα. Ibid. col. 694.

† Ibid. col. 698.

‡ Ibid. col. 700.

ART. II.—*Questions de Droit Administratif.* Par M. de Cormenin. Paris. 1837.

IN all questions there is an essential difference between the theoretical and practical view of the subject, and it often happens that when the one promises every possible advantage, the other teems with innumerable evils. The slightest collateral force causes a moving body to leave the straight line on which it received its original impetus, and, according to the same rule, an unforeseen obstacle gives to legislative measures a very different tendency from what their framers designed. In France, without consulting the existing exigencies of the country, certain dogmas have been laid down as the ground-work for future legislation. Equality and centralization—the one apparently essential to the full development of social rights, and the other fascinating on account of the uniformity of its administrative system—have been the favourite doctrines on which popular writers have dwelt, and republican legislators built their political structures.

That all men are equal before the law is according to the spirit of the British constitution; but French statesmen have carried the principle of equality still farther, and endeavoured to remove the distinctions between man and man in their social condition. So completely does this object engross their attention, that in order to secure it, they have sacrificed a great portion of their personal liberty. Neither individual freedom nor personal security are equivalent in their estimation to equality and uniformity. Step by step they seek to reduce to the same level all classes of society, and, by placing property on an entirely new footing, render the rights of succession uniform. Feudal privileges are for ever extinct—hereditary honours no longer exist—primogeniture is entirely disregarded—and the law of inheritance has confined within very narrow limits the power of the testator. The right “to do what one likes with one’s own” is not acknowledged in France, for the law interferes in the most minute family transactions, and regulates with extraordinary severity the relative duties of private life. Marriages, &c. are subject to a thousand restrictions and formalities, which contrast strangely with the latitude existing in England, and the free agency which each individual there enjoys. The effect of these severe rules and minute legislation has been to produce an uniformity in the relations between different members of each family, and reduce, as near as possible, to an equality all persons composing the same society. Eccentric wills, the caprice of individuals, and disproportionate marriages, tend to produce those

vicissitudes and inequalities which often mark the history of private families in England; while the government of France, by defining minutely the laws of contracts and successions, has rendered prejudice inoffensive and caprice nugatory. The state has made itself responsible for the parental authority and filial duty of its subjects, and if it has failed to draw these natural ties closer, it is not for want of severe laws to enforce them. This legislation in domestic details naturally tends to produce social uniformity, and, by fixing a general rule of conduct, prevents the variety which would accrue from the conflicting opinions of individuals.

Perfect equality, however, is impossible; but the nearest approximation to it is the object of French reformers; and if they have failed to prevent the wealth of individuals from raising them above the mass of fellow-citizens, they have successfully precluded the transmission of that hereditary importance which distinguishes the aristocratic families of England. With an unsparing hand they have crushed all seignorial and feudal claims; and, without reserve or exception, rooted out of the civil code all advantages of birth, and every institution of primogeniture.

“Toute institution de majorats est interdite à l’avenir.”

Bulletin des Lois, No. 308. May 12, 1835.

By this law a fatal blow has been struck at local attachments, or the interest the occupiers took in the soil. The hope to preserve an ancient family in wealth, or found a new one, can no longer be enumerated among the happy vanities which link men to the land of their birth; for the actual possessor of a large *demesne* foresees the inevitable division of his property, and knows, however persevering he may be in amassing wealth, that sooner or later it must be distributed amongst his co-heirs. The law has not actually limited the amount of men’s fortunes, but it has taken every precaution to prevent their accumulation. Equality has in this instance been sought after even at the sacrifice of more important interests; for the repeated division and subdivision of the land must completely disorganize society in the provinces, and expose the country to the evils of absenteeism. The object of the law is however in part obtained, for although one man in his time may aggregate wealth above the common average of fortunes, the next generation is certain to reduce it to the ordinary level by parcelling it out in numerous fractions.

That the law of inheritance should be uniform we will not attempt to deny, but that either the happiness of individuals, or the welfare of the country, have been promoted by the law as it now stands in France, is more than we can readily allow.

Property is either personal or real, or, to use their own language, *meubles ou immeubles*; but notwithstanding the distinction, the same law of succession applies to both. The inconsistency is apparent, for amongst all people where the laws have been formed by experience, and not moulded on an abstract principle, land has been preserved from division, while personal property is subject to equal partition.

“In great cities,” remarks the learned Maleville,* “where wealth is chiefly personal, there was no inconvenience in an equal division, and such in consequence was the custom; but in departments where property was principally real, every death would cause such division and subdivision as to prevent the composition of a farm, or the perpetuation of a family. In such districts it was usual to appoint an heir.”

This distinction was not the effect of chance, but the natural consequence of the different positions of the agricultural and commercial classes. It was, however, in direct opposition to the principle of equality, and as that principle was to form the base of the French laws, the constituent assembly struck the distinction out of their code. Democracy has been the only gainer by the change; for neither the ties between father and son, or brother and brother, have been strengthened, but on the contrary, family connections are rendered of less importance, and the rallying point which the chief afforded to the younger branches of the clan entirely destroyed by it. Individuals may emerge from the ranks of the people, but it is almost impossible for a family to maintain its position in advance of the crowd for more than a single generation.

Act 913 of the Civil Code tacitly acknowledges the inconvenience of applying the law of equal partition in its utmost rigour, but the disposable portion is so small, and the power to will away so restricted, that it can scarcely be said to interfere with the general principle of equality.

We cannot refrain from illustrating the subject by alluding to the history of a family whose downfall will serve as an example of what is daily taking place in every department of France. The Marquis de ——— possessed a splendid castle, but moderate estate in Auvergne; his family had been domiciliated there time out of mind, and in the olden days had a right on the inhabitants of the neighbourhood for the performance of *guet et garde* at the castle.

Notwithstanding the general cheerfulness of his disposition, there were moments when some unpleasant thought came like a

* Jacques de Maleville, ex-president de la Cour de Cassation.

summer cloud over his mind, and darkened for the time his natural gaiety. On one occasion in particular, we remarked that he was extremely depressed, and, perhaps, with more freedom than judgment, inquired the cause of his sorrow.

“I have seven children,” he answered; “and when this small estate is parcelled out amongst them, the castle as well as the name of De —, will no longer have a place in the map of Auvergne. Sons and daughters have alike received a better education than their parents ever had, and are, in consequence, subject to more fictitious wants than either their mother or myself have hitherto felt. My fortune is too small to make them all happy in indolence, and too large to oblige any of them to follow a profession. I have tried what I can do; but my efforts have hitherto failed to give them any lucrative employment. My eldest son is in the army; but he only awaits my death to retire on the income which the seventh part of this property will allow him. My second neglects the law in anticipation of the same inheritance; while my third is married, and looks upon more than one child as the greatest affliction heaven could impose upon him. I will not weary you with the histories of the remaining four; but it grieves me to the heart when I think that not one of them all looks upon this house and hearth of mine as his future home. Are you surprised now that I do not replace a brick which falls from the building, or plant a tree which would require twenty years to grow to maturity?”

Eight years subsequently to this conversation, we revisited the same spot, and found the old man's prophecy fulfilled. He had died full of years and virtues; while his children were living in Paris on the revenue each derived from his fractional portion of the patrimony. The eldest son had left the army; the second had sold his law books; while the third was dead, and his seventh share in the spoil was subdivided amongst his three children. We could find no trace of the remaining four; but sons and daughters alike had left the place of their birth, and gone to seek a home elsewhere. The estate itself had undergone a great change in its external appearance: instead of the venerable and comfortable aspect it once bore, it resembled a patchwork ground which had been laid out by the poor-house on the allotment system. The soil, it is true, produced more in its present subdivided form than under its former aggregated state; but this small increase of bread was a poor compensation for the luxurious shade, the cool fountains, the serene retreats, and picturesque beauties, which were once objects of local pride to the villagers, but had now fallen before the plough, and been converted into monotonous fields of standing corn. We know that

most of our readers will differ with us on this subject, but, standing on the ruined terrace of Chateau de —, we could not persuade ourselves that the greatest happiness of the greatest number had been consulted in the agrarian distribution around us.

Maleville remarks that the districts whose cultivation requires the greatest number of hands, are generally the most peopled; but experience proves that they are by no means the most wealthy. It is only in a democracy that constant division can be of any use; for there the reduction of wealth to the common standard, is necessary to support the institution: but under all other forms of government, it is the very worst system in the world.

For our own part, we are fully convinced that the existence of a landed oligarchy, or the accumulation of real property into large estates, is not only advantageous to the agricultural population, but also to the manufacturing communities. It is the principle of division of labour applied to the entire body of society; by which one portion attends solely to the cultivation of the soil, while another devote their complete attention to manufactures, a third to trade, and so forth. In this manner, each interest becomes consolidated, and the different pursuits stand a better chance of being brought to perfection. Ancient prejudice, however, had given an imaginary precedence to landed property over commercial wealth; and the sticklers for social equality determined, in consequence, to aim a decided blow at the former. They could not have devised a more effective stroke than the one already dealt by the equal division of real property. The law of succession is the foundation-stone on which the principle of equality stands; the prominent feature in the social state of France. It is this law which has annihilated the aristocracy, and established what is called the monarchy of the middle classes; a government which professed to destroy merely aristocratic abuses, but which is, in reality, the commencement of a pure democracy. Every change or commotion tends towards this end; and although many statesmen (like Guizot) have felt the necessity of checking this tendency, their individual efforts have had no avail against the overwhelming power of the lower orders. That power was acquired in consequence of the aristocracy forsaking the vessel of the state, instead of attempting to steer her on the course of reform: had they themselves begun the work, they might have conducted the proceedings with moderation, and prevented the anarchy which was consequent on their voluntary flight.

At the present moment, an aristocracy, in the common acceptance of the word, does not exist in France: there is no he-

editary peerage, no landed wealth.. A house of peers created for life by the Crown, becomes a mere instrument of monarchical power: an hereditary peerage, with the actual division of real property, would soon degenerate into a body of paupers. The materials to create an effective house of lords do not exist in France, or, as we shall have occasion often to repeat, there is no estate between the crown and the people. The struggle, whenever it takes place, must be between monarchy on the one hand, and democracy on the other: there is no intermediate interest. An aristocracy such as exists in England; closely connected with the welfare of the labouring classes, and ranking in its numbers the popular leaders; bound to the soil by their landed property, and intimate from their station with the usages of their country; acting as magistrates at home, and as legislators in London; alternately setting at defiance the encroachments of the crown, and braving the indignation of the mob; neither dependent on court favour, nor independent of the thousands who live on their estates; but loyal as well as brave, and as anxious to seek popularity as determined to resist any attacks upon their privileges: such an aristocracy does not, and never can, exist in France.

Aristocratic vanity still lingers in the saloons of Paris: titles are not altogether without their adulators, and respect is paid to historical names; but the political influence of the old nobility is entirely destroyed, and the remnant of that fallen body are idle spectators rather than participators in the passing scenes.

The vacant place in society is not filled up, but the hostility which was once directed against the nobles of the Faubourg, is now evinced towards the purse-proud aristocrats of the finance. These, in their turn, have become the subjects of vituperation; for the spirit of democracy, like Shakespeare's Cassius, is never at heart's ease while it beholds a greater than itself.

There is an essential difference between the revolutionary movements of England and France, which ought not to be overlooked in comparing the political history of the two countries. In England, organic changes have been first entertained by members of the aristocracy, and afterwards spread amongst the people in general; while in France the people themselves have invariably begun, and often achieved without assistance, their revolutionary measures. The wars between the houses of York and Lancaster were maintained by the nobility; and so great was the havoc they committed in each other's ranks, that the fall of the feudal system followed as the immediate consequence of it. On the termination of the Tudor despotism, the nobles again took a leading part in the struggle between Charles and his parliament; and even at the most recent period of our history, the

Greys, Lambtons, and Russells, have been the first movers and chief promoters of reform, or, to use the language of the opposite party, revolutionary measures. In France, on the contrary, the nobles have generally emigrated in such large bodies, that the field has been left clear for the mob to work their will; and, if we believe the Deputy Berard, the revolution of July was entirely effected by the hands of the lowest artisans. When the movement commences in the higher circles of society, and proceeds in a downward course to the humble classes, the manner in which it is conducted, as well as the object it finally aims at, are of a very different character to the violent and often ill-defined proceedings of an ignorant mob or insubordinate soldiery. In the former case, an effort is made by the best-educated, to raise to their own level the great portion of society which they consider unjustly placed below them; but while they wish to extend the franchise, admit to a participation in the administration, or open the schools of learning to the subordinate classes, they cautiously avoid deteriorating, or rather carefully preserve the privileges and accomplishments their exalted situation has given them. Theirs is the laudable zeal of men, who have attained the utmost round, to assist those who are toiling on the first steps of the ladder, to ascend to an equal elevation with themselves; but when revolution proceeds in the inverse order, and the people act without the concurrence of the aristocracy, the sole object the movement party have in view is to pull down those who are above them, and reduce society to their own humble level. The people seldom understand the meaning of liberty, but confound it with an idea of general equality. The law which protects the rights of all without interfering with the freedom of any; the administrative justice which avoids inconveniencing the innocent while it seeks to punish the guilty; the principle of property which allows each man the full enjoyment of his own, and respects, with a sort of religious awe, the sanctuary of the hearth; are seldom the ends for which a people rise, or an association is formed. Other and very different results have followed the popular movements in France: the name of liberty has been invoked, and the goddess herself (personified by a harlot) paraded in the streets; while government spies have pried into the secrets of every family, and political martyrs suffered on the scaffold for their heretical opinions. The progress of refinement has been retarded by the blows dealt against the privileged classes; and we believe that arrests on suspicion are more frequent in France at the present moment, than during the most profane and palmy days of the monarchy.

The object which many have in view is neither civilization nor

free agency, but the removal of those distinctions in society which cause humiliation or wound self-complacency. They seek equality rather than liberty, and prefer to endure a thousand restrictions sooner than be cast into the shade by superiority of any kind. Their measures tend to destroy landed influence, uproot ancient families, and dissipate the idea which gave to an empty title "a local habitation and a name." The division of property effectually prevents pride and prejudice from cherishing an overwrought idea of home, or contemplating the perpetuation of territorial fame. It essentially confines the owner's plans to the mere moment of possession, and removes from him all controul over the future. No entail secures from sire to son the undiminished though often encumbered demesne, and no hereditary castle encases in its imperishable walls the titular honours of its lord. The constant action of the law is to undo and scatter the accumulated wealth of industry or fortune; to prevent families from growing rich, rather than to secure individuals from becoming poor; to annul *local* interest, and substitute in its place a feeling of citizenship.

The natural sequel to equality of fortune is equality of education; and equality of education tends to produce equality of intellectual accomplishments. Where all are obliged to follow some manual profession, scarcely any find leisure for literary recreation; and the equal education which preserves many from sinking into total ignorance, allows only a few to rise above mediocrity.

A nation, however, may exist and prosper without local ties in its internal division, degrees in its social scale, or great luminaries in its literary circles; but it is only in countries where these sources of greatness have never existed, that their absence causes no inconvenience to the state. America commenced her career with equality amongst the colonists; and the vast tracts of unoccupied land which invite emigrants to the west, render the prevention of strong local attachments almost a necessary policy: but in France, a totally different organization had been established, to which the national mind had accommodated itself, before any attempt was made to introduce democracy, or level the numerous distinctions in society.

Unless the political institutions of a country accord with its social regulations, there is little chance of the one being permanent, and a certainty of the other resisting the imposition. Domestic habits and popular prejudices are the foundation of the social system, while a national government and legislative assembly form its culminating point. There must be harmony in style and proportion between the base and the capital, or else

the whole will not only present an incongruous mass, but the superstructure will in all probability overbalance the foundation. The experiment has been made: attempts to fix a cumbersome and intricate constitution on a simple and undeveloped form of society have failed in Spain, Portugal, and Greece. The distinct character of the various provinces, and the want of communication between them, incapacitated Spain for a system of centralization and a purely representative government. Madrid is virtually though not geographically more distant from the neighbouring districts, than London is from the most northern borough of Scotland; and the unsophisticated inhabitants of the Biscayan Provinces naturally look to their own villages for liberal legislation, and never dream of waiting for a tardy communication with the capital. The Greeks, who, under Turkish rule, had been accustomed to a simple municipal government, could scarcely comprehend a mixed constitution, with its complicated forms and numerous offices. To them the legislative customs of Europe, as well as their German king, were strangers, and as strangers they gave, and still continue to give, them welcome. Instead of taking root, and spreading profusely, like plants which are native to the soil, and born to the climate, the European institutions of Greece are obliged to be reared with care, and preserved from exposure, like exotics. It too often happens, that theorists build in their cabinets models which, when exported to the site they are intended to occupy, are found perfectly inadequate for the position: reminding us of the wooden houses which in the carpenter's shop appear perfection to the colonists, but when erected in Australia, are less suited to the exigencies of the climate than the rudest cabins of the natives.

The British constitution is the natural growth of the soil; and every variation in it has been the necessary consequence, and not the forerunner, of popular changes. In other words, the government of the country has been modified in obedience to the previous progress and wants of society, instead of society being obliged to follow in the wake of an advanced and initiatory government. Toleration had spread through the land before Catholic Emancipation passed the legislature; and the boroughs in schedule A had sunk into utter insignificance, before the Reform Bill blotted them from the map. The habits and character of the people have produced the constitution, instead of the constitution moulding and forming the habits and character of the people. Where the former is the case, the government is certain to be permanent, because the nation value it as a structure of their own building; but wherever the latter has been attempted, the people resist the supreme power as a stranger merely sent to

coerce them. This principle is strongly illustrated in France, where the central state deposes its agents to manage the affairs of the communes, instead of the commune electing its own officers to treat with the central state on their mutual business. The municipalities of France possess the shadow without the substance of power: for while the qualification of voters is placed on such a graduated scale as to admit in some communes the entire body of the people to the municipal franchise, the executive authority is entirely vested in nominees of the central government. This dependence on a superior power destroys all enthusiasm in local improvements; for the merit of public works depends more upon the Board of Bridges and Highways, than on the allodial direction of the commune. It is in our nature to be more attached to the *mediocre* works of our own exertions, than to the superior productions of foreign enterprize; and in proportion as the central power interferes with the internal affairs of the commune, local attachments and territorial prejudices are weakened and destroyed. Centralization has affected the communes in the same manner as the repeal of primogeniture has affected the landed interest; it has alienated the affections of the residents by circumscribing their authority in domestic or local politics, while the law of inheritance reduces the occupant of the soil to the position of a life lease-holder. Neither can take that active interest in the improvement of their town or patrimony, which the corporations of America display in *their* municipalities, or the English landlord evinces in *his* hereditary demesne.

Authority, instead of being divided, as in America and England, is contracted and centralized on principle in France: the mass of the population do not, in consequence, consider themselves identified with the government, but look on the constitution itself as an alien established amongst them. Centralization answers the exigencies of a military government; for by excluding the country districts from civil authority, it turns the minds of the people to martial prowess: but in the time of peace, we are convinced that, unless each department has an interest or voice in the disposing of its local affairs, it will imagine itself at variance with the central authority. It is natural to corporate bodies, as well as to individuals, to be discontented with proceedings in which they themselves have taken no part; and there are instances of a people preferring to remain stationary, rather than have improvement gratuitously forced upon them. In proportion, therefore, as power becomes centralized, it requires to be increased in strength; for its authority must be well supported, in order to have any influence at a distance from the centre from which it emanates. The municipal authorities in America and

Turkey require little extraneous support, because they are created by the people themselves, and entrusted by them with the management of affairs. Obedience in such cases is only deference paid to our own embodied opinions, because we ourselves indirectly create the office, and elect the person proper to fulfil it. This is not the case in countries where centralization exists; for there authority must rely on its own strength to enforce its decrees, and not expect from the governed any assistance in the fulfilment of them. Authority, unless armed, falls to the ground in France; for it has not those moral supports which uphold it in England and America. Centralization may be necessary in a small military government, but certainly is detrimental in an extensive empire: it advances civilization in its earlier stages, but prevents its dissemination after it has grown to maturity.

To prove the first of these positions, it is necessary to shew that France has not obtained from her municipal institutions the same advantages as England and America have obtained from theirs. Public authorities, when elected on the spot, and responsible to those over whom they govern, are not only more respected, but are also more circumspect in the exercise of their powers, than when they are under the influence of the crown, and have the same patronage to defend them as they had to appoint them to the office. The only road to employment is the antechamber of the palace, and subserviency in that quarter is necessarily a greater recommendation than popularity in the district. No advantage is taken of the love of interference, so common to human nature; no use made of the vanity which induces us to support an institution of our own creation; neither are local ties drawn closer, nor local prejudices consulted: one uniform plan pervades the entire country, and the law relies for obedience, not on the love of order, but on the fear of incurring penalties by infringing it. Centralization is not the natural growth of the soil; it is not the result of the local wants of the provinces, nor the readiest means by which they obtain their wishes: it is a theory ingeniously drawn up in the study, but forced into practice without consulting the exigencies of the country:—the work of seclusion, and not the effect of experience.

The principal towns of France have not prospered in proportion with the capital, nor have they even kept pace with the rising towns in neighbouring countries. We do not allude to the large cities which have risen as it were by magic in the manufacturing districts, but to the smaller towns which in England have followed step by step every metropolitan improvement. The vanity of an active corporation, or the interest of

wealthy landowners in the neighbourhood, have prevented these provincial places from falling into the rearward of civilization, which, if left to their internal resources, have neither size nor revenue sufficient to maintain their present state of prosperity.

Towns of a similar class in France have either retrograded or remained stationary; here and there a government building appears like an emissary from Paris; but without the assistance of the central authority neither change nor improvement can take place. Municipal privileges are too restricted for the population of rural towns to take sufficient interest in local politics, while the influence of the metropolis is so sensibly felt in the most trifling affairs, that the eyes of the entire country are essentially fixed upon it. The energies of the communes are not fully developed, nor does their separate interest obtain that attention which it would acquire if it were confided to their own immediate care. In a well organized system of municipal government the advantages of small and great nations are combined, for we believe it is generally allowed, that under a mild and just rule social happiness is more perfect in a small community than in the most extensive and powerful kingdoms. The cause of this superior happiness proceeds from the opportunity a small state affords its government of knowing immediately and relieving without delay the wants or afflictions of each portion of its people. Large territories with a central authority do not possess this advantage, unless extensive powers are entrusted to the municipal governments in the provinces. The distance from the capital is not then felt, and the population of the frontiers enjoy the same advantages as the district in the immediate vicinity of the seat of government. It is true that the country assumes in consequence the appearance of a confederation of little republics, but the nation as a whole is noways weakened on account of this subdivision of power. In empires of great extent it is found to be the chief means of preserving them entire. Turkey has survived the most violent political shocks in consequence of the independence of her municipalities, and if local prejudices were not respected, and the principle of self-government were not adopted in India, it is probable that that heterogeneous empire would split into a hundred conflicting nations.

It is a mistaken idea to imagine that the extension of Russia necessarily increases its weakness, as it depends entirely on the policy adopted towards the newly acquired countries whether those countries become a source of strength, or an additional burden to the metropolitan state. If by a rash attempt to incorporate them with the governing country, their customs and municipal liberties are either infringed or abrogated, the people

of the acquired country look on the supreme authority as the arbitrary will of a conqueror, and their own situation as the humiliating consequence of defeat; but when left to enjoy their local privileges and entrusted with the government of themselves, their annexation is modified into an offensive and defensive alliance, and the augmented power bears the imposing appearance of a numerous federation, rather than the unwieldy form of an overgrown single state. Mutual support makes the distinct parts adhere, and each province, while it enjoys internal independence, relies on the union for its external defence.

The geographical position of France admits of a greater degree of centralization than would be practicable in the British, Russian or Turkish empires; but even in a compact territory like France, the frontier provinces must feel inconvenienced by their distance from the seat of government. Their wants are different; their manners, customs, usages, distinct from those of the metropolis; and it stands to reason that they who are native there and "to the habit born" should be best calculated to regulate their local concerns. The municipal corporations have the same interests as the people from whom they are selected, and are naturally expected to exert their authority in promoting the common cause; but in France their power is so restricted, that their unity of interest is of no avail, and without the consent of the central government their fitness to administrate can be of little service to the commune. A stranger would be equally adapted to the place, since the actions of the municipal body depend upon the dictates of the supreme power, instead of proceeding from their own free will. The government is strengthened by this system of centralization, but the liberties of the subject, and the local advantages of the provincial towns, are neither promoted nor developed by it. Equality, however, the great object of French legislation, is materially advanced by destroying local influence, and placing the entire country under the uniform control of the central authority. The excitement as well as activity which are sometimes displayed in consequence of local politics in England, are unknown in the provincial towns of France; neither the election of municipal officers, nor the struggle of opposing parties, disturb the tranquillity of the village, or open a road to the ambition of the inhabitants. Their eyes are turned towards the capital, and to the capital they must look even for an appointment in their commune.

We do not deny that some advantages accrue from the system of centralization, but we maintain that those advantages are counterbalanced by the concomitant evils. Fierce contests for place, with the heart-burnings and disappointments which attend

them, are either avoided, or confined to the anti-chamber of the palace. The field in which the rival candidates struggle for place is not the scene on which the victor exerts his future power. All the posts of importance being in the gift of the privy council, provincial towns do not feel the party jealousy and animosity which sometimes follow a contested election for civic honours in England. The successful *prefet*, or mayor, receives his appointment from the capital, and is independent of influential parties in his local jurisdiction. The order of the central board is the rule as well as defence of his conduct; for from them his power emanates, and on them he throws the responsibility of its exercise. By these means family interest and individual wealth are neutralized, while government possesses an equal hold on every portion of the kingdom. Centralization puts forth another claim to our notice, which, if fully established, would, in these parsimonious days, make more converts than all its boasted uniformity; by disbursing on a general system the sums which otherwise are left to the discretion of local trusts, it professes economy in the expenditure of the public money, and a more equal distribution of its consequent profits. That this is true in some instances is undeniable, but we appeal to any traveller, who has visited the two countries, whether the public service is best performed by local highway trusts in England, or a central board of '*ponts et chaussées*' in France. While putting the question to this test, and weighing the merits of the different systems by the administrative laws, which proceed from the centralized authorities of France and the independent municipalities of England, we must not only consider how far the tranquillity of the community is secured, but to what extent the free agency of the subject is endangered.

By *lois administratives* are understood the orders and regulations which emanate from the constituted authorities of the state, and have for their object the better advancement of the public service. These laws are from their nature variable, and are modified according to the circumstances of the times and the characters of the men in authority. On them, however, depends a great share of the comfort and safety of the citizens; for when this discretionary power is overstrained, it becomes the insolence of office; and when it shrinks from all interference, it fails to effect its object—public order. The only guaranty against either extreme must be found in the organization of the administrative body itself—in the qualification of the members who compose it—in the popular character of their election—and in the responsibility they incur. We will enumerate the component parts of this administrative polity, state the limits of their

privileges, and trace the gradation by which authority is delegated from the central power to the lowest functionary.

In doing so it is impossible to avoid admiring the order and symmetry of the institution; but at the same time it is equally impossible to avoid observing that its popular utility is completely annulled by the direct interference of the crown. The principle as well as the habit of self-government is completely lost, because the king appoints the chief officers; and centralization is carried to such an extent, that the functionaries act only in obedience to the supreme authority. Every precaution is taken that the local authorities do not transgress the limits of their duty, but on the other hand no check is found to control the arbitrary will of the central council. There ought to be a reciprocal dependence, for without this mutual check there can be no guaranty against the abuse of power. If the mayors were elected by the municipal council, and the *prefets* chosen for a term of years out of a list recommended by the general councils, the municipal and departmental institutions might be something more than a name; but the system, as it now exists, only presents the form of a republican body animated by the spirit of an absolute monarchy.

The laws which emanate from such a body naturally partake of both qualities; and while they display the levelling character of republicanism, are enforced with the uncompromising severity of despotism. They take away from the communes the disposal of their own revenues, they forbid the erection of a church, hospital, or theatre, without leave from the central power, and force them to execute at their own expense the public works proposed by the Minister of the Interior. These principles are essentially despotic, but on the other hand they destroy the local influence of power or property. Sacrificing individual interests at the shrine of social equality, they constitute a code which captivates the eye by its uniformity on paper, but must revolt the judgment when studied in practice.

Placed under the immediate inspection of the executive power, the administrative bodies are more occupied with adapting their operations to the political designs of government, than in the mere abstract application of justice. Elected as well as directed by the same power, they feel the necessity of acting in conformity with its spirit, and rather assist in promoting the movements of the ministry than in maintaining the existing order of things in their own jurisdictions. Possessing a wider range and endowed with a greater variety of attributes than similar institutions obtained in former times, or now enjoy in other countries, the administrative power is, nevertheless, a mere instrument in the hands of government, without those ties of family and place

which would unite it with the mass of citizens, or that independence of action which might form an obstacle in the way of an arbitrary ruler.

The municipal body is composed of the mayor, his assistants, and the municipal or town councillors.

The mayors and assistants are nominated by the king, or in his name by the *prefet*.

Their tenure of office is for three years, unless suspended by the *prefet*, or removed by the king.

The number of assistants is regulated according to the amount of population in each commune.

They, as well as the mayor, are chosen from amongst the municipal council, and ought to be domiciliated in the commune.

Persons in the police, army or church, or such as are employed in the courts of justice, or administration of the forests, roads, &c. cannot be elected to serve as mayors or their assistants.

The municipal council is composed (including the mayor and his assistants) of from ten to thirty-six members, according to the population of the commune.

The municipal councillors are elected by the commune, and from the list of electors. Their tenure of office is for six years, one half of the body retiring every three years.

The electors are composed of the highest rate-payers, and the inhabitants who hold rank in the army, law, colleges, national guard, &c.

The king can dissolve the municipal council.

Each department has its general-council. The number of members is regulated according to the number of cantons, and their tenure of office is for the term of nine years.

The king convokes the council, fixes the duration of its sitting, and can dissolve it at his pleasure. Its debates are secret, but the *prefet* has the privilege of being present, and taking a part in them.

Each *arrondissement* has also its council, which differs very little in its constitution from the departmental council, except that the term of office is six instead of nine years.

The general councils are elected by the citizens, whose names are entered on the the grand jury, or who have a vote for members of parliament.

The *prefet* is named by the king, and liable to be dismissed at pleasure.

The council of the prefecture is also chosen by the king.

The council of state is composed of the ministers of state, the councillors of state, or privy-councillors, the *maîtres de requêtes*, and the auditors; a secretary is also present at the sittings.

The king appoints the president and vice-president.

The great power reserved to the crown—the unlimited choice it has in the nomination of *prefets*, mayors, &c.—the authority to convoke, adjourn, and dissolve the general councils, together with the right of suspending or dismissing its civil officers, have entirely destroyed the principle of self-government, and neutralized the popular character of the administration.

The principle of equality, however, has not been lost sight of—the levelling system pervades the entire organization of the body—every precaution has been taken to prevent the accumulation of power in the hands of a single family, and to give to the municipal councils the character of a republican institution. Art. XX.—In the small communes “*les parens au degré de père, de fils, de frère, et des alliés au même degré, ne peuvent être en même temps membres du même conseil municipal.*”

The outward form of the municipal body is in perfect accordance with the spirit of the civil code; both are republican in their nature, and both are based on the principle of equality; but while the civil code is nursing republicanism round the hearth of the subject, the popular form of the administrative body is rendered ridiculous by the overwhelming prerogative of the crown.

The laws and institutions of the country naturally tend towards republicanism, and in order to counteract this tendency it is necessary to strengthen by extraordinary powers the central authority. There are only two interests in the country—the crown and the people; between the foot of the throne and a republic neither a step nor a gradation intervenes. Centralization is in consequence necessary to uphold the king, but it is neither in keeping with the civil institutions of the country nor in accordance with our ideas of liberty. The monarchy, however, stands in need of it, and of every other support; for should it lose its footing, there is neither an hereditary aristocracy nor a landed interest to break its fall.

The *prefet* and his general council, as well as the mayor and his municipal council, are merely the means through which the departments and communes represent their wants and circumstances to the minister of the interior, and by which the minister of the interior transmits to them his orders and regulations. Their functions consist rather in obeying the council of state than in exerting their independent judgment in local legislation.

This combined system of equality and centralization has only been produced in France by means of repeated revolutions, and could not be ingrafted on the institutions of any long-established community without inflicting a blow on the security of property.

In new and rising states, like America, it is lawful to try experiments, and raise the fabric of society on a new and original plan; but in altering ancient constitutions, we are bound to consult the interests created by the past, as well as to calculate the advantages we anticipate for the future.

Security of property is the basis on which all national greatness is built; for without this foundation it would be impossible to raise the superstructure of trade, commerce and credit. We do not think that there is a theorist desperate enough to deny this axiom, nor do we hesitate to appeal to the past history or present condition of any country in the world as a confirmation of the assertion. Constant change and unpausing activity wear out the moral constitution of nations as well as the bodily strength of individuals; and we find an ultra-liberal writer of to-day attributing the brief existence of Athens to the restless energy and feverish thirst for change which are inseparable from democratic institutions. The lessons of history should not be given in vain, and we believe that, if the durability of nations is faithfully traced to its original cause, security of property will be found to have been the prominent feature in long-existing governments. Allowing this maxim to be self-evident, the enemies of property, or friends to a community of wealth, have defined the right of possession to be the actual occupation of a tangible good, and confined the application of a general principle concerning property to this restricted meaning of the word. According to them, social distinctions and personal precedence, the growth and remains of the feudal times, do not come under the name of property, or ought not to be respected as such; but there are many who take a larger and we think a truer view of the subject; who not only look with jealousy on any change on the law of inheritance, but extend the doctrine of inviolability to property in every sense of the word, whether it be applied to privileges like the immunities of freemen, or to the more common topic of abuse—the possessions of corporate bodies.

They who hold the latter opinion, maintain that the same respect should be paid to hereditary honours and titular distinctions as to the more substantial possessions of land or money, and look with as much alarm on the suppression of titles, as they would upon a general confiscation of real property. The revolutionary attack on armorial bearings, *in fact*, merely effaced an useless ornament from the panels of a carriage, but *in principle* it constituted a blow against all hereditary rights. Heraldry may in the abstract be absurd, but the mere circumstance of shields and supporters being baubles and toys, does not

authorize us to wrench them from families wherein they have descended like heir-looms.

Distinctions which are invidious can be levelled without injuring individual interests, or violating the principle of property, by simply extending to all the privileges which hitherto have been enjoyed by a few. If, instead of suppressing titles or erasing armorial bearings, the French revolution had created dukes and counts innumerable, it would have destroyed the moral influence of titles as effectually as the herald's office has nullified the honour of bearing arms; but now, although the power of the nobility is gone, and an upstart society take precedence at court, a halo—albeit hourly decreasing—encircles family titles; and the fallen remains of the Montmorencies and Rochfaucaulds cling to a distinction which, in the dreary day of their flight, was charged against many of them as a crime.

Had the levellers stopped here, we should have considered their work as a lesser evil; but, after the destruction of titular distinctions, they aimed at the equalization of wealth. This is still the retiring goal which they are labouring to attain; the day-dream which flatters their imagination, or the nightmare which interrupts their repose. Without the violation of property, it is impossible to produce equality; for until the entire community have a share in the land, there must be an aristocracy of wealth. The Owenites and St. Simonians boldly avow this principle; and all other innovators must adopt the same tenets, or forego their hostility to aristocratic institutions.

With the French Revolution began a war of opinion, which, notwithstanding the diversion afforded by Napoleon's wars, still continues to divide Europe. The one party have enlisted under the banner of social equality, and by marches and counter-marches are attacking every privileged order in the state. The Church hierarchy, the lay nobles, the eldest born, the chartered universities,—all men and corporate bodies by whom special favours or immunities have hitherto been enjoyed,—are doomed to destruction by the levelling spirit of these devotees of equality.

The strong-hold of the party is Paris, the grand scene of their crusades Spain and Portugal; in England and Ireland they have raised their cry, but no considerable number have joined them. The greater portion of wealth and talent are still embarked on the opposite side, and this more powerful party take their stand on the doctrines of the inviolability of property, and the necessity of degrees in society. With them property ought to have weight in the councils of the nation, instead of numerical force, and a strong line of demarcation exists between the various classes into which God himself has divided mankind. The inscriptions

on the banners of this party are the altar and the throne, while the argument used in support of their claims is, that the wealthy few should legislate for the indigent many. Social equality they consider as impracticable, and republican institutions essentially short-lived. In raising the fabric of society, they consult just proportion as much as solidity; and, to borrow the language of Burke, surmount the Doric and Ionic pillars of the lower and middle orders by the Corinthian column of Aristocracy. Centralization is quite at variance with the principles and practice of this party—for local interests, landed influence, and provincial importance, are not only the consequences, but the inherent parts of aristocratic institutions. This question was a subject of dispute between the Girondins and Jacobins in the days of the National Convention; and then as now, the Ultra-Republicans warmly advocated the system of centralization. By it they saw that personal domination was annihilated in the provinces, and the seat of all power placed under the immediate inspection of the metropolitan population. Their cry was for the unity of France and its government; their fear was of federalism, and individual influence in the departments. The same contest between these two principles still lingers on, but without any decided victory being obtained by either party. At the close of the first revolution, the advocates of equality and centralization had gained a complete triumph on their own ground, but were unable to propagate their principles beyond the frontiers of France. The restoration was expected to reanimate the defeated party, but the feeble government of the elder Bourbons was unable to adjust the balance. The revolution of July was begun to avenge insulted rights; and continued, because neither king nor minister had the courage to check its force. The repeal of the ordonnances was the avowed object of the people's rising, and the avowed object was all the people obtained; for excepting the change of the elder for the younger branch of the same family, France retained her former social and political position.

The men who since the revolution of July have presided over the government of France are neither distinguished by their measures nor remarkable for their success. Their policy has not partaken of that liberal hue with which they coloured all their former attacks on the ancient regime, nor have the promises of a brilliant hereafter, which obtained for them the reins of government, been fulfilled by their possession of power. Their opinions on the contrary seemed to have changed with the change of things; and they who were innovators in Charles's time, are conservatives now that Louis Philippe has mounted the throne.

The bankrupt and discarded Lafitte remains a living monument of the ingratitude and niggardness of a citizen king. Casimer Perrier modelled the retarding system, which has since partially checked the popular current. Broglie, Montalivet, Thiers, and Guizot, have given their aid to the coercive measures which caused as well as punished the repeated attempts at assassination. The king, himself, who was once the prime favourite of the mob, is now the main stay of absolute governments in Europe. Something beyond mere caprice must have worked this revolution in men's minds; for the statesmen under the Orleans dynasty see things from the summit of power in a very different light from that in which they beheld them when standing on a level with the crowd. It is not a single minister who has apostatized from the popular side, but all have in some degree tried to check the republican movement, and prevent the catastrophe to which it naturally tends. Paris has been placed in a state of siege—detached forts planned to command the capital—laws against political clubs enacted—the national guard in the liberal departments disbanded, and a constant war carried on against the liberal press. The day, however, has gone by when an effective stand could be made against democratic principles in France. Centralization is too closely interwoven with the administration, and equality too firmly rooted in men's minds, for either an aristocracy to arise in society or local independence to exist in the departments. From France the contest has been removed into Spain, where war to the death is carried on between the independent Basque provinces and the friends of centralization at Madrid.

The absolute governments of Austria, Turkey, and Russia, are an effectual bar to the question being even mooted in their dominions; for it is only in countries which already possess popular constitutions, or are struggling to obtain them, that an opportunity is afforded for advocating either principle. When the tide of revolution shall have invaded the steppes of Russia, and wormed its way into the heterogeneous empire of Austria, equality and centralization will be then in the East as now in the West of Europe, the chief instruments employed for the overthrow of the ancient regime. Whenever that day of dismay may break on astonished Europe, the friends of social degrees and local government will look in vain amongst the ruins of the fallen monarchies of the North for the defence of their invaded privileges. Too little regard has been paid to the maintenance of an aristocracy, and their admission to political power, for the nobles to possess either skill or inclination to defend in the hour of danger the threatened stability of the throne. In England, although

the contest is already begun, the most desperate defence will be made; for notwithstanding her civil wars and liberal institutions, England is still the most aristocratic nation and least centralized government in Europe. The doctrine of equality, however, has some advocates, and considerable advances have been made during late years towards a more centralized system of administration; but we think that the day is far distant when the provincial jurisdictions shall be absorbed by the central government, and the outworks of aristocracy carried by the democratic party.

ART. III.—*Shakespeare's Autobiographical Poems.* By Charles Armitage Brown. 8vo. London, Bohn, 1838.

IF there could be any deduction from our obligations to genius, it would exist in the world of dulness, which it animates to the perpetration of so many cruel volumes professing discoveries in dark passages, explanations of obsolete words, and a thousand other modes of outrage which go nigh to cheat us out of half our admiration and delight. It is difficult to believe, that such wills o' the wisp are not, for the most part, devoted to the mischievous ambition of leading our wits astray and leaving them in the mud. Such plodders in regions where they are lost, have seldom any view beyond the acquisition of some site on which to construct a temple to their own fame; and whilst they are lopping and chopping in one direction, and grubbing up and planting blinds in another, they depend for their success on the sacredness of the ground upon which they have intruded. Few, we imagine, can abandon themselves to the contemplation of such regions, without a desire to demolish these speculators in their attempt to deface them; and holding it our duty to afford what protection we can, we maintain a jealous observance of all suspected persons.

Of those who have suffered from the attentions of ambitious admiration, there is, perhaps, no one since the commencement of letters, who has so good a right to complain as our great and wondrous dramatist, who has undergone, and who promises to undergo to the end of time, every degree of injury that can be comprised under the head of misrepresentation. Wherever his meaning is susceptible of distortion, it has been distorted; and wherever his character or his history are obscure, they have been enlightened by so many inventions, that the Shakespeare we would fain have before our eyes, becomes a Proteus, whose identity seems never

likely to be established. Under these manifold trials of patience, the reader who chances to be more anxious to receive enjoyment than to display his sagacity, feels, that the only truly valuable work which time may possibly contribute to our pile of commentaries, must be based on an endeavour to reduce the miracles of Shakespeare, to the simple symmetry in which he left them, and to draw from that only remaining authentic source, such particulars concerning him as have hitherto been denied to us. That such a source is not unproductive, we have interesting proof in the volume before us, which has challenged our attention under the novel title of "*Shakespeare's Autobiographical Poems.*" The addition to this title, certainly caused some depression in our expectations, since it explains, that there is no discovery of new poems, but only a new view of the old ones. Nevertheless, it was our business to read; and our business has been our pleasure, to an extent which leaves us more obliged to the author, Mr. Charles Armitage Brown, than to very many of his predecessors.

Mr. Brown's qualification for pointing out much that has escaped the eyes of others, lays claim to considerable confidence, not only from the absence of all affectation of critical importance, and from the manifest desire of pursuing truth for truth's sake only, but from the somewhat astounding declaration, that the works of Shakespeare, whatever else he may have *read*, have formed his only *study* for the space of thirty years. Hard, indeed, would it be, if a devotee so persevering, had obtained no farther inspiration than the passing stranger, who but bent the knee and was gone; lest, however, he should be thought to enforce his opinions too dogmatically, Mr. Brown, with a candour greater than usual amongst authors who happen to be riding their favourite hobby, tells his reader boldly that he is an enthusiast; that though he will fairly state all sides of any disputed point, he is predetermined that nothing shall drive him from that which he has maintained for thirty years; and that, therefore, those who go with him, would do well to proceed with caution. In fact, he admits, what never yet was admitted by commentator of any description, that his judgment really may be fallible, and it is, therefore, that we feel ourselves the more bound to express our opinion of its general correctness.

Before going into the business of this volume, and interesting ourselves amongst the pleasant and probable biographical inferences drawn from the great poet himself, let us ask a passing question on the regret expressed in the introduction, that there was no Boswell companion to keep a more certain diary, and render farther speculation unnecessary. Would any one, so

sincere in his admiration as Mr. Brown, seriously and reflectively be content, that its great object, denuded of his mystery and romance—the wizard garments which have contributed to conjure up so much of our wonder, and communicated to the deathless page, one charm the more,—should be exhibited, like poor old Dr. Johnson, in all the inadvertencies, the moody and repulsive grumblings, and the ten thousand weaknesses of human nature? That such a collection of shreds and patches would have possessed superlative interest is beyond a doubt; but we cannot see any advantage to the victim of such broken confidence, beyond the praise of having bequeathed to the genius of future generations, a painful lesson on the necessity of standing aloof from friendship, and shaping every word and action with a view to publication. Familiarity, in the case of Shakespeare, could certainly never have bred contempt; but it may be doubted, whether it would not, in a great degree, have bred satiety. The mechanism of which we have learnt the secret, however it retains our admiration, has lost both our curiosity and our wonder, and our eyes move onward to something which is less comprehensible. To see the mighty muse of Shakespeare biting her nails for a bright thought, like a mere mortal, would disenchant us woefully; whilst the contemplation of her work, as one of those wonderful phenomena of nature, as to which we can never get beyond a speculative guess, is an exercise which can never tire, or cease to afford delight. In repudiating the kind offices of a Boswell, we would almost hold, that, in most instances, the less we know of a writer's history, the more we are likely to profit by his labours, and that it is ungrateful to examine farther into his privacy than he himself has thought proper to lay it open. Nothing contradictory to this opinion will appear in our approval of Mr. Brown's book.

To those who have hearts to sympathize with genius in the difficulties which bar the road to independence and fame, it will be gratifying to learn, that the doubts so long entertained respecting the early indigence of Shakespeare are, in Mr. Brown's work, converted to a moral certainty that he never was in any position which was not at once comfortable and respectable; unless, perhaps, from the age of ten or eleven to about fourteen or fifteen. After this period, we put full faith in the conclusion that he supported himself, not by holding horses at the door of a London theatre, but by acting as clerk to an attorney in his native place. To establish this interesting fact, Mr. Brown quotes, in the first place, a passage from Thomas Nashe, in "*An Epistle to the Gentlemen Students of the two Universities*," prefixed to Robert Green's "*Arcadia*," and dated 1589. As

Green, in this work, calls Shakespeare "an upstart crow—one who supposes he is as well able to bombast out blank verse as the best of you;" and as Nashe makes a pun, in italics, on the word Hamlet, it is pretty clear, that the sarcasms on the trade of *noverint*, (a term for a lawyer's clerk of those days), can have no application but the one assigned to them. The words of Nashe are these:—

"I will turn back to my first text of studies of delight, and talk a little in friendship with a few of our trivial translators. It is a common practice now-a-days, among a sort of shifting companions, that runne through every art, and thrive by none, to leave the trade of *noverint*, whereto they were born, and busie themselves with the endeavours of art, that could scarcely Latinize their neck-verse, if they should have need; yet English *Seneca*, read by candle-light, yeelds many good sentences, as *blood is a beggar*, and so forth: and if you intreat him fair, in a frosty morning, he will afford you whole *hamlets*; I should say, handfuls of tragical speeches. But, O grief! *Tempus edax rerum*,—what is that will last always? The sea, exhaled by drops, will, in continuance be drie; and *Seneca*, let bloud line by line, and page by page, at length must needs die to our stage."—p. 11.

In following the clue here given, Mr. Brown says—

"That which at once establishes the passage as being aimed at Shakespeare, and proves he had been a lawyer's clerk, is to be found in his works. Law phrases are strangely numerous there, as noticed by Malone and Chalmers. Of course they are more observable, according to the subject, in some plays than in others. But what is most to the purpose, lest it should be said they were acquired in London, is to show that in his earlier works,—his poems,—his mind was astonishingly haunted by professional terms; the verses continually offering metaphors and illustrations, picked up from the desk of a lawyer. I shall quote the most remarkable lines out of many that I have marked, nor did I seek for them attentively when I marked them. Besides which, I took no notice of his constant references to "debts," "loans," "quittance," and similar phrases of an accountant, though they might be ranked among a country lawyer's terms. Altogether, they swarm in his poems, even to deformity. To begin with some from *Venus and Adonis*,—the subject was surely no temptation to them."—p. 13.

We have here two or three pages of isolated quotations, such as the following:—

"Being judge in love, she cannot right her cause."

"But when the heart's attorney once is mute,
The client breaks as desperate in his suit."

"Her eyes petitioners to his eyes suing."

"But when he saw his love, his youth's fair fee."

" Which purchase if thou make, for fear of slips,
Set thy seal-manual on my wax-red lips."

" Say for non-payment that the debt should double."

&c. &c.—pp. 13-14.

Then from the sonnets :—

" But be contented ; when that fell arrest,
Without all bail, shall carry me away."

" The barren tender of a poet's debt."

" The charter of thy worth gives thee releasing."

" So thy great gift, upon misprision growing."

" Of faults conceal'd wherein I am attainted."

" Which works on leases of short-number'd hours."

" And I myself am mortgaged in thy will."

" He learnt, but surety-like, to write for me."

" Why so large cost, having so short a lease ?"

" My heart doth plead, that thou in him dost lie,
(A closet never pierced with crystal eyes,)
But the defendant doth that plea deny,
And says in him thy fair appearance lies.
To 'cide this title is impannelled
A quest of thoughts, all tenants to the heart :
And by their verdict is determined
The clear eye's moiety."

" After reading such lines in the poems of a young man, if critics should hesitate at coming to the conclusion that he had been employed in the office of a lawyer, unless the lines bore the semblance of being imitatively and not spontaneously written, my faith in all internal evidence will be shaken."—pp. 15-16.

Besides proving, in conjunction with such lines as the foregoing, that Shakespeare was an attorney's clerk, the passage from Nashe fixes the representation of the first rough sketch of Hamlet, at some period anterior to 1589, and before the author was twenty-five years old ; in opposition to three or four learned commentators, who maintain it to have taken place in 1596 or 1597. We infer from it likewise, that he had been a star of some duration, or he would not have created such bitter jealousy. Furthermore, it is known, that in 1589 he had a share in the Black Friars' Theatre, with four names below him. Thus, it requires small stretch of credulity, to suppose him continually prosperous from his entrance in the attorney's office. Indeed, he had scarcely time to be otherwise. Having seen his contemporaries accuse him of studying dramatic composition from the tragedies

of Seneca, whilst at the desk, the probabilities are, that he only quitted it in conformity with his taste, and in consequence of some theatrical success during the periodical visits of the players to the town of Stratford.

Thus far, however, the poetry of Shakespeare, though conducive to his biography, is not to be called autobiographical, which title must apply exclusively to that portion of his works which has hitherto been known as a collection of sonnets. These so-called sonnets (up to the present period so little understood, that one great critic has considered them addressed to a young man, and another to Queen Elizabeth at the age of sixty-five) Mr. Brown has, strangely enough at this time of day, clearly demonstrated to compose six consecutive poems, in the sonnet stanza. This is the great discovery of the book; and a very valuable one it is, since, as the author observes, it is a key that unlocks a source of pure, uninterrupted biography,—at all events, for a considerable portion of time. That the sonnets are the genuine work of their reputed writer, no one who reads them can entertain a doubt, though the rareness of such readers may, very possibly, have created one in the minds of those to whom they are known only by name. We trust Mr. Brown may bring them more into fashion, since an advertisement at the end of his volume announces that he is preparing an edition for the press.

As it is no unimportant business in the biography of Shakespeare, to ascertain who were his friends, we will, in commencement, allow Mr. Brown to settle the question respecting the personage to whom the five first of these poems really are addressed.

“The first difficulty, and to that, strangely enough, research has been chiefly confined, is the discovery of who was ‘Mr. W. H.’ Thorpe, their first publisher, inscribed them—‘To the only begetter of these ensuing sonnets, Mr. W. H.’”—p. 38.

“From the Sonnets themselves we distinctly learn, by particular passages, and by their whole tenour, that ‘W. H.’ must have been very young, remarkably handsome, of high birth and fortune, and a friend of Shakespeare. His youth and beauty, not being factitious advantages, are constant themes for praise; and his birth and fortune are proved, exclusive of other evidences, expressly from the following lines in the 37th Sonnet:

“For whether beauty, *birth*, or *wealth*, or wit,
Or any of these all, or all, or more,
Entitled in thy parts, do crowned sit,
I make my love engrafted to this store;
So then I am not lame, poor, nor despised,
Whilst that this shadow doth such substance give,
That I in thy abundance am sufficed,
And by a part of *all thy glory* live.”—p. 41.

Amongst the ennobled friends of Shakespeare were——

“William Earl of Pembroke, and Philip, his brother, Earl of Montgomery, to both of whom Heminge and Condell dedicated their folio edition of Shakespeare. Their words in the dedication are,—‘But since your lordships have been pleased to think these trifles something heretofore, and *have prosecuted both them, AND THEIR AUTHOR LIVING, with so much favour*; we hope, (that they outliving him, and he not having the fate common with some, to be executor to his own writings) you will use the same indulgence towards them, *you have done unto their parent.*’ Consequently ‘Mr. W. H.’ according to my perception, and as conjecture has already pointed out, may, with every probability short of certainty, have been William Herbert, afterwards, when the folio was published, William, Earl of Pembroke. Not only do the initials belong to the name, but the title, ‘Mr.’ was not improperly applied to the eldest son of an Earl, there not having been, at that period, any grander title of courtesy.

“But it is necessary to consider the time when the *Sonnets* were written, together with the age of William Herbert, and they will not be found contradictory. That young nobleman might have been eighteen years old, not more, but probably a year younger, when the first part was addressed to him; an age when he might well be termed ‘boy,’ and in accordance with the feeling of the poems. In proof of this, he was born in 1580, and it was in November, 1598, that Meres, in his *Wit's Treasury*, noticed the *Sonnets* of Shakespeare as being then circulated in manuscript among his friends.”—p. 40-41.

We have a note appended, from Lodge's Portraits, which informs us, that “in the spring of this year [1598], William Herbert, with his father's consent, came to London, and continued to reside there.”

As the life of this William Herbert, afterwards Earl of Pembroke, was much devoted to learning and poetry, it may be assumed, since every circumstance is in its favour, that, in the first flow of youth, when the love of poesy in such a mind is most strong, he sought out our poet, and proffered his friendship.

To heighten the wonder that these poems should so long have remained a puzzle, the 152 stanzas of which they are composed, are actually divided into six nearly equal parts, each concluding with an appropriate envoy, which marks their bounds distinctly. The subjects Mr. Brown has settled to be as follows:—

“FIRST POEM. Stanzas 1 to 26. *To his friend, persuading him to marry.*

“SECOND POEM. Stanzas 27 to 55. *To his friend, who had robbed the poet of his mistress, forgiving him.*

“THIRD POEM. Stanzas 56 to 77. *To his friend, complaining of his coldness, and warning him of life's decay.*

“FOURTH POEM. Stanzas 78 to 101. *To his friend, complaining*

that he prefers another poet's praises, and reproving him for faults that may injure his character.

"FIFTH POEM. Stanzas 102 to 126. *To his friend, excusing himself for having been some time silent, and disclaiming the charge of inconstancy.*

"SIXTH POEM. Stanzas 127 to 152. *To his mistress, on her infidelity.*"—p. 46.

To accommodate his reader with the immediate means of ascertaining the propriety of the above explanations, the author has given the substance of each stanza. Indeed, his diligence and candour are entitled to all praise; but how far his aim is answered, of exalting the private character of the great object of his admiration, may be a matter of discussion.

In another part of his work, Mr. Brown has a long and ingenious argument to prove that Shakespeare was no flatterer, and, generally speaking, we think him successful; but we cannot assume with him, that truth can in nowise be flattery, which looks like an axiom suggested by his partiality, to defend a point where he knows that argument must fail. Let all credit for truth be yielded to the following samples of compliment paid to William Herbert in the first poem, and we imagine that, notwithstanding the high strain of poetry from which they are condensed, it would be difficult to find an author who would be content to have written them.

"*Stanza 1.* In order that beauty may never die, we desire offspring from the fairest creatures; but you, loving none but yourself, are your own enemy. You, that are now the world's fresh ornament, are burying happiness in its bud, and committing waste by parsimony. If you have not pity, you, together with the grave, will deprive the world of its due.

"2. Should you be asked, when your youth is no more, where is your beauty? where your lustihood? it would be shameful and unavailing to reply,—'Within my own deep-sunken eyes.' How much more praise-worthy would it be if you could answer,—'This fair child of mine shall sum up my count, and make my old excuse,'—proving himself your successor in beauty. This were to be young again in age; to see your blood warm, when you feel it cold.

"3. Look in your glass, and tell your face it is now time there should be a copy formed of it. If that duty is neglected, the world is cheated, and some mother unblessed. For what virgin disdains to be your wife? What man is so foolish as to permit the love of self to thwart the love of offspring? Your mother sees herself in you, in the lovely April of her days; so you, hereafter, in spite of wrinkles, may see yourself as you are now. But if you live and die single, your resemblance is for ever lost.

"4. Why is your profitless beauty confined within itself? Nature gives nothing, but frankly lends to the free; then, niggard of beauty, why do not you convert her gifts to use? A miser without usance, why

can you not live by the use of such large sums? You deceive yourself in your own self-love. What account can you render to Nature when she calls you hence? By not putting your beauty to use, it will die without being your executor."—p. 57-58.

Throughout the poems the style of praise is the same. "But," says Mr. Brown, "it may be asked, did Shakespeare meanly stoop to flatter an earl's son for personal beauty? Did he seek to make a profit out of the youth, at the expense of turning him into a coxcomb?" This is a question which sets one's conscience and one's partialities by the ears sadly, and we would rather leave our reader to answer it as he thinks proper. One thing, however, we must state, by way of guidance to his decision, and that is, we have read over the five poems to Master William Herbert very many times, and can perceive no hint in them that the writer was ever laid under obligation, of any kind whatsoever, to his friend, except for the trifling present of a pocket-book, which he gave away. It is, perhaps, not too much to presume, that the person who could be pleased with the flattery to his beauty, would be little satisfied with the omission of his generosity, had he ever shewn any. Still it is hard to conceive that the great poet was not actuated by something more than friendship; for, whatever other assaults that feeling may withstand, we do not believe it to be proof, like love, against the treachery of its object. That William Herbert was guilty of that crime to an extent to which human passions have, perhaps, never been reconciled, appears in the title to the second poem, in which we learn a circumstance, unluckily by no means problematical, viz., that Shakespeare, in spite of his wife and family, had a mistress, and that Master William Herbert, in spite of Mr. Brown's information that he is known to have been the worthiest nobleman of his day, ran away with her. The mode in which the patron took the poet's advice, to transmit to posterity a copy of his handsome face, was certainly no bad satire on the style in which that advice was given; yet, notwithstanding this offence, we presently find Shakespeare lamenting that he has shewn any anger at the transaction, and wishing his friend joy of his bargain.

"40. Take all I love; you had all, before you took her. If you love her for my sake, I cannot blame you; if otherwise I shall. Gentle thief, I forgive your robbery; though you have stolen all my property; and though it is harder to bear a wrong from love than an injury from hate. Kill me by your blandishments towards her, with spiteful thoughts; yet we must not be foes.

"41. The licence you give yourself, forgetting me the while, well befits your youth and beauty, for temptation follows you every where.

You are gentle, therefore apt to yield; you are beauteous, therefore to be wooed: and when a woman woos, what woman's son will deny her? Ah me! but yet you should forbear, and chide your beauty and your straying youth, when they lead you, in their riot, to break not only your faith to me, but her's.

"42. I am grieved that you have her, for I loved her dearly; but it is a worse loss, through her means, to be deprived of you. I would fain excuse you both, by saying that my friend loves her for my sake, and that she loves you because you are my friend. If I lose you, it is her gain; and the loss of her is my friend's gain. But my friend and I are one: so I may sweetly flatter myself that she still loves me and no other."—p. 69.

If this was mere friendship, we must believe Shakespeare's generosity to have been even more miraculous than his genius. Mr. Brown has suggested, for the benefit of those whose enthusiasm may not carry their credulity so far as his own, that the motive for the first poem might have been gratitude for patronage bestowed upon the Black Friars Theatre. If he had found it of so much importance, it was certainly worth maintaining, in the second, by the cession of a mistress who is described to have been herself the most culpable party.

How long the acquaintance continued, we cannot tell; for the poems to William Herbert occupy only a space of three years, as we learn from the last of them.

" Three winters' cold
Have from the forests shook three summers' pride,
* * * * *
Since first I saw you fresh, which yet are green."

It would seem, that the style of society to which he was introduced by this scion of nobility, or in which he met him, gave a material turn to his ambition. More refined habits probably confirmed his naturally refined mind in a disgust to the coarse lives of the players, with whom he never could have felt more than a professional sympathy; and we find him, at the age of thirty-seven, expressing shame at his calling, as well as at the effect it had produced upon him.

" Alas! 'tis true I have gone here and there,
And made myself a motley to the view,
Gored mine own thoughts." * * * *

" O for my sake do thou with fortune chide,
The guilty goddess of my harmful deeds,
That did not better for my life provide,
Than public means, which public manners breeds.

" Thence comes it that my name receives a brand,
And almost thence my nature is subdued
To what it works in, like the dyer's hand.
Pity me then." * * * *—pp. 38-39.

It is true, however, that this more sensitive character may, in some degree, have owed its origin to other causes, for, in the poem immediately preceding this, he apparently complains of ill success; a misfortune of which description must probably have been far more galling to him than the generality of his admirers would suppose, since all writers upon him have agreed in his carelessness of fame. This has been imagined from his having left no publication of his works, and, as his poems testify, very erroneously. The instances they furnish, wherein he promises immortality to the person celebrated, are numberless; and, should they not be sufficient to establish his yearnings for that prize, and his confidence in obtaining it, we may turn to the envoy to the second poem, which proves him in nowise less sanguine than the bards of old:—

“ Not marble, nor the gilded monuments

Of princes, shall outlive this powerful rhyme,” &c.—p. 71.

The posthumous publication of the plays, forms no real contradiction; for it may easily be concluded, with Mr. Brown, that the delay was considered important to the interests of the theatre, in which his share seems to have continued until his death. Admitting this, there is much force in the reasoning whereby our author accounts for his belief, that Shakespeare's omission of preparations for printing are ascribable to accident.

“ There are a few words in the *Dedication* to the first folio, by Heminge and Condell, his friends and copartners, of strong implication that not only was his death unexpected, but that it was his intention to publish his dramas himself. His works, they say, ‘*outliving him, and he not having the fate, common with some, to be executor to his own writings,*’ &c. How can these expressions be interpreted otherwise than thus?—‘It was his intention to be the executor of his own writings, but he was prevented by an untimely fate.’ And in still stronger words, they say in their *Preface*,—‘It had beene a thing, we confesse, worthie to have been wished, that the author himself had lived to have set forth and overseen his owne writings; but since it hath been ordained otherwise, and he by death departed from that right, we pray you, &c.’

“ As for the patience with which, we are told, he endured the piracies of booksellers, and the use they made of his name to works not written by him, this by no means proves that he was reckless of his productions. It may with equal force be said, that, resolved to publish his works himself, their piracies and abuse of his name would, in the end, do him no injury. But it is not clear that he was patient; all we know, is, that he and his partners were called the ‘grand possessors;’ and that to steal from them any one of his plays, was so far difficult, as to be a matter of public boasting, as may be seen in the preface to the first edition, 1609, of *Troilus and Cressida*.”—p. 197-8.

What farther insight may be obtained into the history and

feelings of this wonder of the world, by means of the poems, we will leave the reader to obtain by a reference to them, aided by the keen and just remarks of the able writer who has now first made them intelligible. We believe that the only causes of difference with Mr. Brown, will arise from his dogged determination to believe nothing to the disparagement of the being who has formed the most delightful contemplation of his life. This gratitude is so amiable, that we could be well content to be misled by it in like manner; but our profession is the sometimes disagreeable one of shewing the truth. The following passage will substantiate our charge against Mr. Brown, and the remarks thereon exemplify what we say of ourselves:—

“I fear some readers may be surprised that I have not yet noticed a certain fault in Shakespeare, a glaring one,—his having a mistress, while he had a wife of his own, perhaps, at Stratford. May no persons be inclined, on this account, to condemn him with a bitterness equal to their own virtue! For myself, I confess I have not the heart to blame him at all,—purely because he so keenly reproaches himself for his own sin and folly. Fascinated as he was, he did not, like other poets similarly guilty, directly or by implication, obtrude his own passions on the world as reasonable laws. Had such been the case, he might have merited our censure, possibly our contempt. On the contrary, he condemned and subdued his fault, and may therefore be cited as a good rather than as a bad example. Should it be contended that he seems to have quitted his mistress more on account of her unworthiness than from conscientious feelings, I have nothing to answer beyond this: I will not join in seeking after questionable motives for good actions, well knowing, by experience, that when intruded on me, they have been nothing but a nuisance to my better thoughts.”—p. 98-99

To all this we are supplied with abundant answers by our previous quotations from Mr. Brown's own page, which shews it unnecessary to inquire by what sort of feelings Shakespeare was prompted to quit his mistress, because the stark-staring fact is, that *she* quitted *him*.

We are told, that some portions of this work were delivered in lectures to a scientific institution. If the foregoing paragraph was included, and the said institution chanced to be upon the principle of some others, where the lecturer is subject to a cross-examination from the members, upon what may appear his disputable points, we suspect that, with all his eloquence, he must have had warm work to maintain his ground.

Encouraged probably by his successful research in the poems, Mr. Brown has pursued his purpose still farther and examined minutely into some of the dramas of Shakespeare. In these likewise he has made some plausible discoveries which are well worth attention; and he considers that many more are to be

made. If so, there is no one more capable of hunting them out than himself; and we only hope he will not store them up in his mind, as he has done by the present ones, for the unconscionable term of ten years. We have a great respect for posterity, but no idea of labouring for it exclusively.

There is, however, one of these discoveries which we think open to dispute. It is, that Shakespeare, previous to the composition of the *Merchant of Venice*, made a visit to Italy. We do not deny that there is much close reasoning in support of this; and the commencement of it is gratifying, because it proves that he was, at all events, at the age of thirty-three, in no want of the means of travelling.

“A few years since, it might have been contended, agreeably to the general opinion, that he had not sufficient means for travelling, unless towards the close of his life. Here again, we have to express our obligation to Mr. Collier for the following facts, supported by irrefragable documents, brought to light by him. When Shakespeare was only in his twenty-sixth year, in November 1589, he was one of the sixteen shareholders, the twelfth on the list, in the Blackfriars Theatre. Seven years after this, when that theatre was to be repaired, his name had risen to the fifth on the list; and he was also, together with his partners at Blackfriars, one of the shareholders in the Globe Theatre, at Bank-side. In seven years more his name stood the second on the list, in a patent granted by James the First. In 1608, when he was forty-four years old, the Blackfriars Theatre was valued, owing to the city of London's having proposed to purchase it; and he then possessed no less than four shares, each rated at £333. 6s. 8d. together with the whole (as is stated) of ‘the wardrobe and properties,’ for which he asked £500. All this amounts to £1,433. 6s. 8d. possibly a larger sum than could have been obtained had he sought to sell the property, though he values the yearly profit of each share at no more than seven years' purchase. But if we calculate it at only one half of his estimate, and reckon the value of money as five times increased since that period, his theatrical property alone was worth, in our present money, £3,583. 6s. 8d. Besides this, however, which we learn from other documents, he had previously paid off a mortgage of forty pounds on his mother's property; he had made a purchase of a small messuage, with barn, garden, and orchard, at Stratford, for sixty pounds; he had bought 107 acres of land in or near that borough for £320 (equal to £1,600 at present); he had given £440 (equal to £2,200 at present) for a lease of a moiety of the tithes at Stratford; and it is also conjectured he had lent money on mortgage. From this statement it will be seen he was possessed of nearly eight thousand pounds of our present value, a proof at once of his prosperity and prudence from the time he first married in London; especially if we consider he had a wife and children to support, and probably parents and their children to assist; for we may well believe the clearing a debt of forty pounds on his mother's property was not a solitary proof of his affection towards them. I am delighted to bring

forward these proofs of the reward bestowed on his genius; there is enough to prove in them that he might have well and wisely afforded the expense of a visit to Italy as early as 1597, the year before the *Merchant of Venice* was entered at Stationers' Hall. Lest a doubt should be entertained on this essential point, I need only mention that in a letter extant from one of his townsmen, Mr. Richard Quiney, we find Shakespeare so early as 1597-8 was enabled to purchase land in his own county, and was talked of as an influential person in Stratford." —pp. 101-2-3.

The argument is continued by the demonstration of the poet's improvement in the language, customs, and geography of Italy. A demonstration which we have examined with care, and are ready to admit. Still we find ourselves inclined to side with Mr. Brown's alternative position, viz:—"That he has, at any rate, made known Shakespeare's wonderful graphic skill in representing to the life, Italian characters and Italian manners and customs—solely from books and hearsay." It is difficult to believe that Shakespeare with his engagements at the theatre as manager, player, and author, could have afforded so much time as would have been required, especially in those days, for an expedition to Venice. That he should have stayed there long enough to acquire the language, as is presumed by Mr. Brown, is still more improbable. Besides, if he went to Venice, would he have seen no other places of which a trace could have been discernible in his writings? According to Mr. Brown's chronological order of the plays, *Henry the Fifth* and *As you like it*, appeared in the two years following the *Merchant of Venice*; yet he takes no means to prove a *sojourn in France*, or even a journey through it. Had there been anything from which such a proof might have been deduced, it is not likely that he could have passed it over. To be sure, if we were members of Mr. Brown's Institution, and upheld this position, we would defend ourselves against a *badgering* by maintaining that Shakespeare went *by sea*, and demanding boldly on what other occasion he could have obtained the nautical knowledge displayed in the first scene of the *Tempest*.

Mr. Brown's spirit of discovery is next directed to Shakespeare's learning and knowledge. In the first article he rather unnecessarily combats an absurd opinion of some of his predecessors, that a boy cannot be sufficiently grounded in the classics at a grammar school to complete, of himself, their acquirement afterwards. The argument is good, but we glean nothing from it to drive us from our old opinion, that the learning of Shakespeare was, after his early youth, a mere chance collection, such as might naturally be obtained in reading up the subjects for his various dramas.

The discussion of his dramatic knowledge and art is managed with great taste and power; and, were we not fearful of transgressing the limits usually accorded to the notice of a single volume, we would willingly extract that portion entire. It is the condensed result of a life's devotion to the proprieties of the drama, and we are persuaded that no one who has *not* devoted a life to them can read this essay without improving his judgment. The necessity of qualifying truth with a certain impression of improbability in order to give it a truthful appearance, would, at first sight, seem paradoxical; but in Mr. Brown's reasoning thereupon we see nothing to dispute.

“ Dramatic representation, like painting, appeals in an eminent degree to the imagination. In proportion as we draw the chain closer between distant times and the present day, we attract the sympathy of an audience. Human nature, though never varying in its essential properties and distinctions, is, however, capable of so many modifications caused by remoter and national manners, that it may not always be instantly recognized. Now, in a theatre instant recognition is necessary; for, if once the audience attempts to argue itself into sympathy, the poet's claim to rigid truth will be unavailing. That very fact of making foreigners, or our British ancestors in Lear's time, speak in our own language, is an approximation to our sympathy, while it is absurd to our understanding. If, moreover, it is possible to drop a modern allusion or fact, well nigh unperceived in the dialogue, it will have the magical effect of linking the past with the present, through the imagination, even with the veriest bookworm, for the moment, and we care not for his after cool reflection. Great art is requisite for the management of these linkings together; and many are of opinion that they are best left to the comic characters, because with them a laugh, should it chance to be raised, passes for nothing against the poet, while it assists his purpose. Every thing in the drama, saving the grand principles of human nature, is fiction wrought by art into verisimilitude, not into absolute identity. While the language must breathe of the very time and place wherein it is supposed to be spoken, it must be poetical and picturesque; and, to agree with it, an air of poetry should be thrown over the scenery. At some future period, should the stage have appropriate scenery as well as dresses, the aid of the antiquary will be welcome. There will then be no fear of the minutest attention to propriety; the more accurate the more instructive; the link between reality and fiction will never be broken, as long as the stage lamps are not mistaken for daylight. But the same accuracy must not always attend the dresses; our sense of delicacy would sometimes be offended; sometimes too close an adherence to costume would be misunderstood. For instance, you have told me a Venetian lady must not leave her house unless attired in black, yet Desdemona in mourning, for so would her dress be interpreted, would contradict the text. In the same way a departure from the exactness of chronology in language is necessary, as well as for an appeal to the imagination. If ever the time should arrive when critics insist on the laws of the drama being the same

as those of history, the poet who has no opportunity of inserting a paragraph or note, by way of explanation as he goes on, may meet with the applause of a few but never of the many. The effect of the drama constructed on such rules would be too cold, too distant, too abstract. Man's everyday feeling could not be raised, could not be approached. Imagination would resent its being left in so inert a state; and though the understanding might have nothing to argue against those laws, passion would be faintly excited, and the drama would rather become a poem, possibly an interesting one, not a scene of active, busy life, in which, with one accord, we heartily sympathise.—p. 163-5.

Farther on, Mr. Brown advocates improbabilities upon a broader scale, as being absolutely essential to works of fiction, and we are by no means sure that an author of such works would not do well to read what is here said, and ponder upon it.

Many new traits of Shakespeare are suggested, as we advance, under the head of *His Moral Character*, and, as we have nothing to say against them, we are happy in believing them correct. We will not, however, detract from the interest they are calculated to afford in their collective form, by particularizing more than one, wherein the author successfully substitutes for the poet's propensity to taint his writings with licentious allusion and expression, a disposition to scrupulous purity both in the one and the other. No one who reads will fail in agreeing that—

“Had he lived to edit his own works, doubtless the greater and the worse part of his objectionable passages would have been unknown, particularly in his comic scenes. Buffoon actors, like Tarlton, his fellow in the theatre, prided themselves in adding to the text, and were greatly applauded according to their extemporaneous witticisms. These crept into the text, and became a cause of complaint on the part of Shakespeare, as we read in Hamlet's advice to the players.”—p. 211.

“After all, such passages are far from being numerous, and may be spared without the slightest injury to the text;—another proof of their having been interpolated. Shakespeare himself has let us know, in his poems to Master William Herbert, how disreputable, in his estimation, is licentious conversation; and he forcibly contends that a libertine's authority over his company, or his grace in uttering it, renders it the more dangerous:

‘Lilies that fester, smell far worse than weeds.’”—p. 212-13.

In the course of the volume we had great hopes of finding some more probable guess than we have hitherto met with, respecting the peculiar nature of Shakespeare's religion; but Mr. Brown here confesses himself as much at fault as others have been. The poems make no allusion to it, neither do the dramas. Indeed, the more he might have been imbued with religion, the less likely should we be to find the subject mentioned in such works. From the general tone, however, of their *morals*, and

the benevolence towards human nature, which we believe never fails to be apparent where the business of the scene will admit of it, we can scarcely doubt that he had some certain principle whereby to direct himself, and that this principle was not the mere result of natural feeling. A motive like this would, in the most equably constituted persons, be far too capricious to produce a uniform course through such a length as the works of Shakespeare, and that it would be very steady in a being so intensely sensitive as the most accurate describer of passion that ever yet the world has beheld, is least of all to be imagined. We are not, however, left to a mere inference from these circumstances, for the abhorrence to sin, so widely manifested by his persons of the drama, is, in his poem to his mistress, expressed in the first person, and applied to his own conduct, so as to convince us that religion of some sort had a strong hold on him. There is, besides this, his sonnet to his soul, which goes farther than anything else to place the question beyond dispute:—

TO HIS SOUL.

“ Poor soul, the centre of my sinful earth,
 Fool'd by those rebel pow'rs that thee array,
 Why dost thou pine within, and suffer dearth,
 Painting the outward walls so costly gay?
 Why so large cost, having so short a lease,
 Dost thou upon thy fading mansion spend?
 Shall worms, inheritors of this excess,
 Eat up thy charge? Is this thy body's end?
 Then, soul, live thou upon thy servant's loss,
 And let that pine to aggravate thy store:
 Buy terms divine in selling hours of dross;
 Within be fed, without be rich no more:
 So shalt thou feed on death, that feeds on men,
 And, Death once dead, there's no more dying then.”—p. 222.

Admitting then that he was not wanting in religion, we cannot agree with Mr. Brown, that it is unimportant or unfair to use the same mode of investigation into its peculiar nature which we have adopted with respect to other portions of his character; especially since he has himself helped us to one important fact, in his epitaph, which, till its genuineness is disproved, may, as properly as any other, be classed amongst his autobiographical poems. This little document at all events refutes the supposition which we are told has gone abroad of his having been a deist, and establishes our claim to him as a fellow-Christian. All that we have to learn is whether he was a Catholic or a Protestant, and this question is surrounded by the age in which he lived with peculiar difficulties. The alternations of the Catholic and Pro-

testant faith, during the reigns of Henry the Eighth, and Mary, and Elizabeth, were rapid and violent. Long after the establishment of Protestantism it must in all likelihood have been weak and wavering, excepting amongst those who embraced it from spirit of party or the hope of preferment; and thousands who declared for the new persuasion must yet have cast an eye of affection towards that of their fathers. At the time of our poet it must have been difficult even for contemporaries to assign to each other their particular tenets, and the only cases in which we may now with certainty form conclusions respecting so distant a period, are where persons are known to have distinguished themselves by polemical discussion or vilification. Thus, the faith of Ben Jonson, and the majority of his fellow-dramatists, if they entertained any faith at all, was decidedly Protestant (the doubt we have signified arises from the improbability that a sincere participant in either faith can be guilty of outrage upon the other)—was decidedly Protestant, because the Catholic priest, with all sacred things peculiar to him, was too often made the butt of their satire, and the stepping-stone to patronage. Nothing of this unworthy disposition, however, has tarnished the pages of the noble genius, the simple likelihood of whose participation in the unfashionable creed, would, in our opinion, atone for the errors of a host of rivals. This simple likelihood lies not only in his having abstained from such religious buffoonery as he must have perceived to be most acceptable to Elizabeth and her court, but likewise in the decidedly reverential feeling with which he has portrayed the minister of religion on all occasions. So striking a contrast to the taste of the day, may, in fact, be decisive in the minds of most of our readers that Shakespeare certainly never was a seceder from the faith in which he was born—more especially since we have never heard an argument to induce a belief that he adopted any other.

The last portion of Mr. Brown's work is devoted to a chronological order of the plays, with some very amusing and instructive remarks upon them; but, as nothing of consequence is drawn out illustrative of the character of their great author, we do not consider this "in our bond," which was solely to treat of biography. We can only express a hearty wish that genius had never found a worse commentator.

In closing the volume and recommending it strongly to the reader's perusal, we are fain to add to our many expressions of satisfaction the assurance that we shall look to any future production of the same pen with high interest, since nothing, we are persuaded, will fall from it which is not indicative of research, originality, and discrimination.

- ART. IV.—1. *The French Revolution, A History, in Three Volumes.* By Thomas Carlyle. Vol. I. *The Bastille.* Vol. II. *The Constitution.* Vol. III. *The Guillotine.* London. 1837.
2. *Syllabus of a Course of Lectures on the History of Literature, or the successive Periods of European Culture.* By Mr. Carlyle. Delivered at the Marylebone Institution in the Months of April, May, and June, 1838.
3. *Sartor Resartus, &c.* 1838.

WE take shame to ourselves that we have suffered the work whose title stands first at the head of this article so long to escape our attention. The striking peculiarities of style,—no less than the originality of thought, and deepness of erudition,—of which its pages give the proof, ought naturally to have attracted a very minute consideration, even had the subject upon which it has been written been less momentous, less soul-stirring, than that of the great French Revolution. Many books, and of most varied descriptions,—Souvenirs, Memoirs, Biographies, and so-called Histories,—have been laid before the public from its first outbreak down to our own times, each professing, and some of them perhaps not undeservedly, to throw a modicum of light on the causes and sequels of that important phenomenon. Many similar works are still threatened us,—not to mention the “Correspondence” of the various actors, great and small, which friends and executors, sons by birth, and sons by adoption, have already published, and may hereafter publish—the posthumous outgoings of their own revered party-chiefs, royalist, constitutional, jacobin. So that the appearance of a work like that before us, prepared, too, in the very presence of those which preceded it, by one as yet known indeed to few, but to those in all respects chosen few, known only to be honoured,—might reasonably have justified the hope that at last we were to have a history of that great event, which, adopting only that which was valuable in the experiences of those former writers, should succeed in filling the niche in the world’s archives, which, had it depended merely on such as them, would most assuredly have never been filled at all. But we do not regret the delay: a seasonable one it is surely, since it enables us to do our work more effectually, by blending with the consideration of the author’s views on the great event of modern times, another consideration materially helping out the first. We allude to his *Lectures on the History of the Spiritual Progression of Europe* from the earliest down to the present period. It would in any case have been necessary to attempt some delineation of our author’s peculiar opinions, with a view to the better appreciation of his book; but in no way

could we have so clearly and forcibly illustrated our remarks as we could desire to do, but for this seasonable exposition of them which we have heard from his own lips. Indeed, great and absorbing as his historical subject appears, we half question whether we do not feel more anxiety to set the author himself in a right point of view before our Catholic readers, than to do the same by the French Revolution. Or, rather, we would entertain the hope that, if we should succeed in doing the former to the satisfaction of our readers, they will be led to consult Mr. Carlyle's own pages, and so do the latter for themselves ! We proceed at once, therefore, to a brief sketch of the very remarkable man whose work forms the basis of this article.

Mr. Carlyle, we have said, is one of very peculiar opinions. And yet some of these opinions are to be so called only by relation to this country ; they will not sound strangely to our readers who are tolerably familiar with the new ways of thinking now in vogue among the Germans, and their continental disciples everywhere. We allude in particular to what, after all, is the life-giving principle in all intellectual matters,—Religious Belief. In saying this, we are far from seeking to attribute to Mr. Carlyle the infidelity of Germany or any other country ; for to do so would be to fly in the very teeth of his own sincere and heartfelt professions of a better faith. Nor would we hesitate to abandon such conclusions as we have come to on the nature of his Christianity, however well-founded they appear to us, and however extraordinary that abandonment must seem, if Mr. Carlyle had let fall one syllable in any page of his numerous writings that might invite us to believe ourselves in the wrong, and him inconsistent. But as on this he seems studiously to avoid committing himself by a *premature* avowal of his own religious creed,—we say *premature*, and the sequel will show why we say it,—we have nothing for it but to determine for ourselves, by a calm and candid perusal of what things he has at different times let fall upon matters of religious belief,—the leading character of the opinions which he himself entertains on that subject.

And we cannot but confess that, even had we not known Mr. Carlyle to be a fervent follower of certain great German writers, we should have readily understood, from his own productions, the source of his inspirations to be German. Our readers will remember that, in Germany, about the close of the last century, that rage of cavil and contention, which the scholastic philosophers had tended so fatally to keep alive, till it became strong enough of itself to gain the mastery over faith, first in the intermediate stage of Protestantism, and then in various successive stages of scepticism, down to atheism, the last and lowest of all,—

that this spirit, thus resulting in the absorption of its own material, in inanition self-produced, very naturally and quietly laid itself down in the land of its birth and died; the only amends it had it in its power to make for having been born there! Nevertheless, it died not childless: the rancour of denial has left behind it as fatal an enemy as itself to the faith, under the garb of indifference, or as it has chosen for its self-justification to be styled,—Pantheism. Of the actual distinctions and points of resemblance between the atheist and the pantheist,—between the negation of the existence of God, and the negation of any existence that is not a portion of God,—we shall not here speak, nor do more than invite our readers to study for themselves the Christian philosophers of the continent, who, in our own days, have triumphantly assailed pantheism at large. But there is one especial doctrine of the pantheists, flowing immediately from their fundamental dogma, and yet so insidious and captivating when it stands alone, and is not accompanied by a formal profession of the principles whereon it rests, that we should not wonder if it has tended more to prolong the separation of sincere and devout minds from the communion of the Church, than the subtlest of Protestants, or the more formal sceptics, could have done, in the present temper of things. We mean the law of progression and mutability,—a favourite and much-current doctrine of the pantheists. This law has for its basis a very correct but greatly misapplied assumption, that, in his spiritual and temporal state, man is capable of an undeterminedly advancing perfection upon earth, and that his good deeds are only so many steps on the road to it. But this indefinite perfectibility is viewed as wholly incompatible with the immortality of dogma,—the “eternity of creed,” whereon the belief of the Catholic Christian reposes. For, if the whole history of man and of the universe around him be but a fast-succeeding series of the self-creations, the self-decayings, and the self-renewings of the same God,—if God be the ever-changing, and the ever-changing be God,—how should the religion which honours Him possess a character which he hath not? His revealed will,—how should it be aught higher than a mere time-enduring system of the universe, adapting itself to the changes that belong thereto? His worship,—what else but a mere form, an instrument whereof men may serve themselves for a season, till, in their progression homeward to the divine centre whence they emanated, they shall have left it far behind them? Moral laws, whatever their origin, human or divine, are, for the same reason, perishable too: Virtue and vice, what are they but the forms and conventional phrases of a state of existence whereunto they are only suitable because that state

remains as yet one of infancy ; because the men—who appreciate these distinctions of good and evil in their judgments of the phases under which the actions of the All-God are commonly made manifest—have not yet grown out of these opinions, and learned to recognize in the manhood of the true pantheist a better clue to the government of their own lives? With all this awful blasphemy, however, we cannot afford the time to trifle, and we mention it only to attain to a clearer perception of the mode in which this anarchy of the intellect is tending towards a renewal of ancient order. And when, in the hope of a like consummation, we reflect that we live in a land and among a people whose Christianity possesses just so much of resemblance to the true faith of Christ, as to darken conviction and sharpen resistance to his word, and whose system of thought is so based on negations, doubts, and argumentations, as to withstand remonstrance ever the more that to withstand it uprightly and consistently is demonstrated to be impossible :—when we remember to have witnessed in a neighbouring land “to what base uses” this thing may come at last, let us tremble to think that there may exist a necessity by which these are the only uses to which it ever can come,—and that, in these results, it is at last to work itself out among us too, if unchecked much longer in its track of desolation ;—we, in these circumstances, shall find much reason “to rejoice and be glad,” if, before that last sad consummation, a principle of a different character shall supervene,—even though it be absorbing, destroying, chaotic, while it lasts,—provided that it do for scepticism here, what pantheism has already very effectually done for the old scepticism of the Continent ! If “men* have forgotten the creation” of Christian faith, and if it have become necessary that God “renew” in their hearts that spiritual creation, let us remember that, in the history of that other creation, too—the creation of the outward world—chaos preceded ! Anything should be welcome to us before that dogged obstinacy of unbelief, which entrenches itself behind a rigidly dogmatic theosophy of its own creation, and believes itself at once sceptic and orthodox !

To the view, therefore, of the pantheist, while, on the one hand, there is no religious or moral creed that can be pronounced eternal, or even co-enduring with this nether world,—so, on the other hand, no system of belief that influences action deserves reprobation merely on dogmatic grounds. They are willing,—to use a favourite quaintness of Mr. Carlyle, “to take the fact as it stands there, and not to quarrel with it for being there !” And herein consists one of the two peculiarities of the system, which,

* Bossuet, Hist. Univ. 2nd partie, sec. 12.

in a great measure, redeem it in our eyes. For, with this principle steadily in view, all that is recognizable in Catholicity,—in her whole history from her birth in the manger, through countless vicissitudes, to her present state,—stands at once appreciable by all; for when, or by whom, has Catholicity been misconstrued and slandered, but in days when hatred of her rule was the only passport to the new land of peace and brotherhood? but by system-makers, precisians, who, in their solicitude after new things, were most *systematically* anxious, fairly or foully, to get rid of the old? Not so with the founders of Neo-Pantheism. They have no wish for a moment to depreciate the world that has gone before them; and, therefore, not that portion of it which, though they know it not, still subsists in pristine strength, and will alone survive the coming catastrophe! Hence the depth and grave sincerity of those admirable delineations of the middle ages, and their actors, so especially the ages of faith and faithful men; hence the Voigts, the Hürters, and their colleagues. And although some of their readers, adopting their views on the past, have thereupon altogether relaxed in their hostility to the Church, and entered into its communion, not the less do these their precursors in that good work of healing and making whole the Church's wounds, believe her to be as one long since dead, but still retaining the aspect of vitality,—and thus they remain without her pale, unconscious that, though in those wounds there was pain and anguish, yet that they were not, could not have been, mortal; and that she lives now, as ever, for the solace and restoration of her children returning once more, wearied and repentant, from their prodigal and mournful pilgrimage! Upon what this opinion of Catholicism having worn itself out is founded, it is hard to say; but that it exists is as lamentably certain, as to account for it is difficult. A most unhappy phenomenon! They who have “the key of knowledge,” use it, indeed, unconsciously for the good of others,—but “enter in themselves” they cannot! Truly a transition-state: Yesterday was a day of presumptuous turpitudes and wickedness; the morrow is for us a season of much hope, but still of much peril;—meanwhile what more can we predicate of to-day than that it is intercalary? It is ours to improve it now, that so, by our labours, it may ripen into a golden morrow: *ερχεται ὁ νύξ!* And we say that this appreciation of our Church, imperfect though it be, is a great step gained toward reconciliation,—a great help to future enterprise. So, too, and here we come to the other of the two saving peculiarities in this pantheistic system, we must by no means conclude that these believers in the deadness of Catholic belief, do thereby debar themselves, even in their own eyes, from all prospect of a future

change in that opinion. On the contrary, they proclaim, as we have observed, a most especial aversion to any thing like a finality of creed; their desire is to be perpetually changing and bettering in their views; they look forward from day to day with the full assurance of becoming more and more approached to the truth, and disembarrassed of error; and though the truth should at last appear to them in the *now* objectionable garb of Catholicism itself, yet would these men embrace it, having "no predilections to indulge—no resentments to gratify." We need not say that when their discursive wanderings shall light upon this point, there they will end: their impracticable theories of infinite progression, will resolve themselves into the better-understood dogma of perfectibility, as taught in the bosom of the Catholic Church.

In the mean time, there are many persons of clear intelligence and devout mind, Protestants, for instance, who, unable, yet most anxious, to reconcile with their aspirations after the positive and true, the gulfs and voids presented by their faulty, inconsistent manner of belief, come at last to ask of this supposed law of mutation the apology it offers for their own contradictions. Yet, in embracing the aid it affords them, they seek to make a Christian thing of it; and though we cannot but smile at that vain attempt, we cannot, at the same time, deny that it is infinitely less unchristian than the Protestantism, or scepticism, or rationalism of past times. The very doubts and uncertainties which beset it, forbid fanaticism in error; and prejudice, after all, is the chief, and occasionally the only, enemy of the faith. The danger to be apprehended from this scion of pantheism, is of another kind. The men of active minds were, while Dialecticism lasted, the worst foes of Catholicism; in the new order of things, the quietists will offer the most resistance to that "honourable action." It can never satisfy the men of enquiring mind, and fully imbued with their own principles; the love of dogma will tend to fixedness of dogma. Meanwhile, they love the positive,—abhor negations,—and hold the Christian faith on a pantheistic basis. This is the case with Mr. Carlyle; obviously so to his readers; in all probability unknown to Mr. Carlyle himself.

But while we say this, once more let us carefully guard against misconstruction. We cannot, do not mean, that Mr. Carlyle is not a Christian. A fervent, sincere Christian is he, though not of the Catholic order. More than that,—we find him more and more departing from the ranks which produced him, more and more diverging from dissent, gradually approximating to the truth. When we look to what his countrymen, Hume and

Robertson, were, and then to what he is, shall we not bless the change? The worst that Mr. Carlyle can find it in his honest heart to say of us, is, that our time is past, that *we* now exist no longer; that, while Catholicity lasted, it did not amiss, but well; that it now does well no more, only because it can exist no more! An immense progress this! Though the homage be not as yet ample enough, it is still much,—much especially for one nursed in the lap of a rigid Presbyterianism. For Mr. Carlyle is a Scot, in birth, in feeling: a warmer admirer of Knox we never knew;—Luther and Knox divide the mental empire over him. And this reminds us that Mr. Carlyle, in spite, if not in consequence, of the laws of “infinite progress” and “finite creeds,” is not without his inconsistencies. We have him now praising Hildebrand—now lauding Martin Luther: now testifying of the beauty of Catholic repentance, and attributing to its inspiration the golden numbers of Dante—now denying that, till Luther, that doctrine was any other than a secret known to one or two of the more pious monks: now anathematising the inroads of logic on the demesne of faith—now censuring the Papal anathema pronounced upon those inroads. We have him by turns contented to put quietly up with any dogma, however erroneous and absurd, provided it be heartily believed in, and productive of practical results of an useful sort,—and again railing at the *errors, per se*, of the Romish Church: by turns deploring the rationalism, argumentation, encyclopædism, of the last three centuries, or exulting over their suicidal end impending upon the present century: and again commending Luther and his myrmidons for their supposed recognition of the pure light of *reason*,—and dealing forth his convictions that, though “the venerable Hildebrand” may well be supposed a believer in Popery, the modern increment of learning and knowledge precludes the belief that any Catholic, “except a highly *irrational* one,” can possibly be sincere! For our parts, we demand only of Mr Carlyle for ourselves and our fellows, no greater favour than he lends to the construction and appreciation of our faithful forefathers: let him, if he really thinks that they did well, that they believed sincerely, that their history—the history of the middle age—is but a record of what Göthe calls “the triumph of belief over unbelief—those two antagonist principles in man:” if, we say, it is thus he thinks of them, we entreat him to add us to their number, and judge of us in the same category as of them; for then we are willing to abide the inference he may draw from it, ready to confess ourselves of the unenlightened. Or rather, if he condemns us merely because he thinks that the Catholics of this day have but preserved the dead forms of doctrine and discipline

bequeathed by their ancestors, but that the spirit of life which then animated them has fled for ever, let him study us once again: there are those among us whose word and work shall give him cause to review his hasty censure, and abandon an accusation certainly novel at this day and in this country. It is hard that the defamers of the middle age should seek to fix on us their groundless calumnies of the past; and that, on the other hand, when one of sincere mind appears and vindicates that glorious era, we should be told, through his lips, that we have no part in its glories, no sympathy, no affinity with its heroes. But we perceive here at work a peculiar species of enthusiasm, a fanaticism against long-established formulas, excellent within limits, reprehensible only when carried to a too great extent. It is this aversion to mere formulas which so eminently characterises our author; this hatred of form for the form's sake, in an age wherein, for the most part, form and symbol are everything, genuineness and intrinsic worth nothing. The prevailing errors of our day are many: among the most sickly and nauseous of these, is that eternal setting of the sign above the thing signified,—that perpetual identification of the means with the end. By “paper constitutions” shall, in these times, the Peninsula be civilized? by “venerable constitutions,” shall a starving people be restrained from violence, and filled as with food? By State-Church endowments, shall our England be recognized for a prime model of a Christian commonwealth? But we anticipate. For Mr. Carlyle these helps are only valuable in themselves, in proportion to the extent to which good shall be realised by them; otherwise, in his ears, the phraseologies within which *form* demands that we contain our speech,—as, for example, the terms, “Enlightened Age,” “Glorious Constitution,” “Church and State,” “Greatest happiness of the greatest number,” “Public Decorum,” and the like,—are perfectly lost and thrown away. He values all this precisely, as he emphatically says, “according to the *meaning* there is in it,” and that meaning, one denoted by facts and actions, not simply by a spoken synonym. All the rest is to him “a Quackery,” “a Formula,” “a Sham.” And heartily do we concur in this. But Mr. Carlyle, we beg leave to tell him, has reason to beware of a contrary error. There is a fanaticism against formulas, as there is one in their favour. True it is that an “*unmeaning* formula” sickens and disgusts one: let us, however, take heed lest we pronounce too soon and immaturely on the want of meaning in any given formula. On what evidence does he rely to support his sweeping conclusion that all Catholicism is now nothing but a dead formula, and that so it must ever be with a creed laying claim to eternal duration? If he

lays this doctrine down *à priori*, let him, in his turn, beware of a *formulism* which is the more dangerous, as its sphere is more comprehensive. We, too, *à priori*, demonstrate the eternity of our creed, and we next maintain it by the secondary aid which an appeal to its long annals and to our interior consciousness will bestow. Till Mr. Carlyle shall have done as much, or either part, it will not be for him to treat our holy religion as one of the dead formulas of human imagining. Nor are we satisfied with his definition of a religious creed, which we have in more than one passage of his works, viz. "a system of the universe;" nor with his application of the rules of mutation existing in ordinary or worldly things, to this sublime, this divine transcendent thing. Let Mr. Carlyle receive our expostulations in a good spirit, for they are framed out of a deep regard for his sincerity and good faith: let him be assured that, if his appreciation of modern events be faulty or imperfect, it is in this solitary but momentous particular,—the influence of the sound and healthy belief of Catholics over their outward actions and way of life; and that, if he would render his portraiture of Modern History altogether life-like, he must, once for all, give recognition to that great fact. It was thus that he was enabled to understand the middle age, a phenomenon that has baffled his predecessors, who judged it with Protestant eyes. The moral influence of the Church over the minds of men, was weaker perhaps in the troubled times at the beginning of this century, certainly more embarrassed and circumscribed of operation, than it is now; and with Napoleon, of all others, that influence must have been of small personal consideration: yet, the memorable charge which that great conqueror and scorner of the ancient things gave to his envoy at the Papal court, shows that he knew too well the vitality of the Catholic faith to set at nought its influence, as Mr. Carlyle would seem to do. His words were, "Be careful to treat the Pope as you would one who has five hundred thousand men at his back." Let Mr. Carlyle ponder well these words, and lay them deeply to heart, if he would appreciate rightly the present condition of the Christian world, and the influences that are at work within it. We know that he sometimes gives vent to the outpourings of his thankfulness, that the German writers have delivered him from the bondage of the prejudices of his childhood, and that he anticipates for the future as much improvement in the present state of his opinions, as that is itself an improvement on those he yesterday held. Hence his aversion to a *premature* profession of his peculiar religious dogmas: herein our promised apology for the use of that word, *premature*! If it be his wish that those opinions shall continue to grow on, and resolve themselves into

new matter, and germinate anew, though in other forms, let him neglect no aliment of growth or reproduction. His earnestness of belief, his sincerity of heart, are beautiful and soul-possessing. His learning is immense; his industry untiring; his shrewdness, his power of detecting the truth amid masses of error, quite extraordinary. Yet he imagines the Church a dead thing, in so far as its influence now-a-days is concerned! How is this? Because, we repeat, he has never studied her modern history with the attention he has given to her past annals,—to the annals, ancient and modern, of every other department of thought and feeling. He begins by assuming her to be dead: no wonder, then, that he considers any study on his part of her present condition to be utterly valueless, and as time thrown away. Let him, we entreat, discard this *prejudgment*, which is peculiarly his own, as he has manfully discarded the *prejudices* of his education, which were not his own, but instilled into him by those he loved and revered, and let him sit calmly down to this important investigation. We promise him that he shall discover, to his abundant satisfaction, that the religion of Saint Gregory the Seventh and of the Crusades is still “a reality,”—no hollow formula “or sham,”*—making its voice heard, and its powers felt, in every part of the civilized globe; working out its destinies here below in every phasis of outward manifestation,—in Poland martyred—in Ireland, militant—in Belgium, triumphant!

And now having, as we believe, sufficiently pointed out in what respects our bounden duty as Catholics compels our disapprobation of Mr. Carlyle and his writings, let us yield ourselves to a far more grateful duty, and one for which he happily affords abundant occasion,—that of commendation. And who that, with us, has turned away palled and heart-sick with the strained conceits and conventionalisms of the last two or three ages—ages of quacks and deluders of all kinds—but will hail with us the appearance of a genuine man on the vacant stage of our national literature. We cannot do too much homage to our author's leading, pervading quality,—the steadiness in aiming at the truth, guided by a singular developement within him of the Scottish calmness and shrewdness of view, and lit up and vivified with an impassioned enthusiasm in that pursuit,—a holy, pure enthusiasm, that must some day have its good results for the single-minded being who has yielded to its sweet influence. To this source are to be traced his deep research, and his honest independence in judgment: for a mind like his, it is but a poor reason in favour of any given conclusion, that this or that distin-

* Mr. Carlyle loves Germany: so do we. We recommend to his notice that highly able work, Ranke's *History of the Popes*, reviewed in our last Number.

guished writer held it before him. In short, he is not a man of the last century; nor were such as himself in the contemplation of Sterne or Tristram Shandy, when the latter, tracing out in epitome the great results of modern British *historisms* and *philosophisms*, cried aloud: "Tell me, ye learned, shall we for ever be adding so much to the *bulk*, so little to the *stock*? Shall we for ever make new books, as apothecaries make new mixtures, by pouring only out of one vessel into another?" Mr. Carlyle is an "imitator" of no one, and, therefore, no portion in the mock-heroic denunciations which follow the above passage, would, in Sterne's view, have fallen on him. He adds little to the "bulk," in adding so much to the "stock" of knowledge; prizing rather, among literary virtues, the golden one of *silence*. When he prevails on himself to utter his thoughts, it is evidently because he holds himself bound to utter them by a sort of mission to that end, unintelligible to littérateurs of bibliopolist views. Hence we have had frequent reason to lament that Mr. Carlyle has said too little, but never, were it to the amount of a single word, that he has said too much. It is with him a common phrase,* "When speech has done its best, silence has still to supply all that is unsaid, more than has been said! The word I am now uttering is of time, of to-day: Eternity is silent! all great things are silent!" Surely this man is not likely to "darken his wisdom by words without knowledge;" to encumber his pages with phrases idle and undigested. Hence, therefore, it is, that his chiefest and mightiest work on that stirring, momentous subject of all others, the French Revolution,—a work that has almost exhausted all that can well be said by man on its causes, events, and actors,—containing more real matter of reflection than any one of the voluminous treatises on the same phenomenon which have been written here and abroad, is offered to the public in the short compass of three octavo volumes! A trashy novelist of the day would not have been satisfied with less space for the development of his *blasé* conceits, than enables the far-seeing intelligence of Mr. Carlyle to lay bare the secret influences which rule the destinies of empires. And not only beyond the writers who have gone before him has he greatly succeeded in understanding and delineating that great political phenomenon; but, we venture to say, almost unqualifiedly, that he alone has understood and delineated it, establishing for himself most fully and undoubtedly an exclusive title to the name,—Historian of the French Revolution! Nor can we doubt that in every honest, generous heart, his views, in greater part, will find an echo. For to the heart as

* Vide his *Lectures and Miscellaneous Works*, *passim*.

to the head he addresses himself. Deep-sightedness has taught him to abjure the foolish and wicked casuistry which seeks to sever public from the side of private virtue, or can see utility apart from the moral law. "There can be," he somewhere says, "no seeing eye without a seeing heart." To him, self-sacrifice,—courage in man to do the good that is in him amid scorn and suffering,—are all in all. Yet never have we met with any writer who exacts less of humanity, who is more disposed to set off in relief to the blackness he portrays, moral features of a fairer kind. Robespierre seems to be the only one of his historical characters in whom he despairs of exhibiting one solitary redeeming characteristic. It is, too, a great satisfaction, of a melancholy kind, that such an exception is so rare: bad, indeed, is the portion of him in whose person it is offered! Yet not false pity, but rather a rigorous sentiment of justice, has dictated to our author his course in this regard: he feels it his duty to investigate, without prejudice or affection, the chronicled career of his actors, for the purpose of drawing thence, for our appreciation, only those incidents which were their own, the forthcomings of their own hearts, the realities which live for ever to the weal or woe of the doers, and their posterity. Doubtless the task is difficult,—a sore trial to an author's sincerity and good judgment; and if, in general, historians have, at the outset, proposed it to themselves, we can only say that we hardly know one that has kept himself faithful to it to the end. But their neglect or failure are not required to make illustrious the complete success of Mr. Carlyle in bringing to a conclusion the duty he had the courage to undertake. Unlike the generality of the writers, who are called historians, throughout his work he has not a hero in view; blaming and commending, ridiculing and admiring the same man, and the same opinions too, as the former oscillate in well-doing, or the latter change their aspect in the altering positions of events. Robespierre, we repeat, is the only wretched object of whom he speaks in an unvarying strain of horror and disgust. For his cause, it is the common one of justice and mercy: men and systems are judged of by relation only to that standard.

There are two blanks in Mr. Carlyle's history, which can only be supplied by a Catholic pen; the first origin of the French Revolution, and the present means of arresting its march in the onward path of destruction. With respect to the first, we consider the seeds to have been originally sown in that spring-time of European calamity, the Protestant Reformation. The Catholic Church, for Mr. Carlyle "a dead thing," affords the solution of the second question.

The principles of negation, or Protestantism, which, about the

time of that ally of Islam, Francis the First, (for Reformation is fortunate in her princes !) had insinuated themselves into the ductile French mind, continued thenceforth more and more to develope themselves in a thousand different channels, ramifying from the same source, till, in the eighteenth century, under the unhappy regency of the Duke of Orleans, and the reign of Louis XV, they had become absorbed in that general abandonment, by the upper classes, of religious profession, if not of belief, to which the way had been already paved by a co-extensive corruption of morality. It was found easier, not to say more spirited, to maintain and justify, upon principle, the want of all principle, than at the same time to condemn and exhibit it. Such, indeed, had been the way with the vicious of former times ; a modern enlightenment went farther. Vice and Virtue were ascertained to be mere conventionalisms : according to the school of Hume, they were but the hallowed names of Utility and Inutility, through the medium of which, in darker times, the science of politics had been considerably explained to the vulgar by the learned and adept. It was therefore taught publicly, that, with a new era of human affairs, ethics must undergo a change : it was well for the superstition of their forefathers to teach that what is moral is useful ; but it was for themselves to reverse this order, by explaining that what is virtuous is only so because it is useful ; that all else is of imposture and fabrication. An opinion once seriously entertained influences action. The rulers embraced with ardour the new suggestion—adopted it—made it their standard and rule of government. Religion had too long shielded the poor ; an *imperium in imperio* was intolerable ; the Gallican liberties (or slaveries) were doubtless much, but not every thing, in the progress of material domination, and the subjugation of the spiritual authority. Destroy it,—and a fair field would open itself to king-craft and state-craft : thenceforth woe to him who should gainsay either ! At whatever cost, religious opinion must be driven back, even as public opinion had long since been ; then would administration prosper in irresponsibility. For themselves, the great men of the state (and here Mr. Carlyle catches up the clue to that eventful history) had already adopted into practice the golden rule of scepticism, which consists simply of the denial of all creed or law, excepting such as are comprised in the three pithy and facile positions,—“ Belief in one’s own existence,—belief that money will buy money’s worth,—belief that pleasure is pleasant.” Propositions that are simple enough, and absurd withal ; yet, in practice, fatal to the actor, insupportable to the acted on ! “ Poor fellow !” said an infidel surgeon once, within our hearing, who seemed

deeply shocked at hearing of the sudden death of a favourite comic actor,—“poor fellow! Well! life is short and uncertain. There is only one way, you know—to *enjoy ourselves while we are here!*” The *grande*es of France did so, with impunity, while faith subsisted among the masses. Decorum, that blessed shadow, covering more sins than ever charity did, appearing, in general, not till the substance has fled far away,—decorum was still preserved in high places and the streets; just so much of it, at least, as would suffice for an engine of strong government, without lending thereby too much of support to the supersensual, or of consideration to its ministers. For the time was not yet come when it was completely to be laid aside. The Jesuits having gone, the monastic orders were to be suppressed, and their lands forfeited to the state; tithes were to follow, and then the secular endowments, when it should be practicable: but the privileged nobility, not the lower classes, should thereby be advantaged. In the mean time, peace and order were to be kept up: the governed were to continue in the ways of religion, and in that name to bow to the powers of darkness and of sensualism that filled the high stations of authority. And for a time it was so; but an example had been set, too brilliant to be long concealed from the gaze of the depressed myriads, and finally it was followed. The multitude, like the few, became infidel, or believed itself to be so. The results were obvious.

“French philosophism has arisen, in which little word how much do we include! Here, indeed, lies properly the cardinal symptom of the whole wide-spread malady. Faith is gone out; scepticism is come in. Evil abounds and accumulates; no man has faith to withstand it—to amend it—to begin by amending himself: it must even go on accumulating. While hollow languor and vacuity is the lot of the upper, and want and stagnation of the lower, and universal misery is certain enough, what other thing is certain? That a lie cannot be believed! Philosophism knows only this: her other belief is, mainly, that in spiritual supersensual matters, no belief is possible. Unhappy! Nay, as yet, the contradiction of a lie is some kind of belief; but the lie, with its contradiction once swept away, what will remain? The five unsatiated senses will remain, the sixth insatiable sense (of vanity), the whole *dæmonic* nature of man will remain,—hurled forth to rage blindly without rule or rein; savage itself, yet with all the tools and weapons of civilization: a spectacle new in history.”*

Scepticism and profligacy, hand-in-hand, made their ominous journey through France,—Versailles being the starting-point. The one aimed at the heart through the head, the other acted on the head through the heart; by opposite means attaining to one

* French Revolution, vol. i. p. 20.

end. It became clear to every enlightened Frenchman that this world of ours was but a hypothesis, a thing of chance, owning no God but force, no laws but those of matter. To physics every thing was reducible: morality, duty, faith, were words of vague import, and discarded accordingly: or if admitted, their significations were altered to square with the fundamental laws of gravitation and repulsion, or others of the visible order. Thus the least materialist of the sophists at that time defined morality to be the palate, by whose smack we judge of the utility or inutility of actions! Nothing was received that was not of the visible, or reducible to it: all things else had no existence for the enlightened. The moral of all this was, that the spirit of sacrifice, the soul of all things desirable here below, made way for that of egotism and covetousness. Except in Christ's name, no one will make himself "Anathema for his brethren." None, therefore, desired office for the country's sake: rather, not the office was desired, but the emoluments. Whether the duties were discharged or in arrear, what mattered it while the wages were paid? Other world was there none; and for this world the temporal power was strong enough to repress opposition or remonstrance. In such a state of things, where rulers, irresponsible by law to their fellow-men, declare themselves equally irresponsible to Heaven, abjuring all belief, and even all recognition of any influences above those of matter, any source of knowledge beyond the encyclopædia, any relations save the mechanical one of cause and effect, it is not surprising that they should have formed their state-policy upon that very basis. It was not to be expected that they should recognise in the institutions and implements of state, more than the palpable things they appeared to be, or regard them any farther than in the immediate consequences they were calculated to produce. For them a monarchy, for instance, was merely a form, consisting of one supreme head, who, nevertheless, would need counsellors to advise him, and a privileged class to attach themselves to his person, as a protection against the canaille, who paid the taxes in support of him and his. A church was a preferment, happily very much at the disposal of the king's ministers, to which some men far behind the age did certainly attach sundry antiquated notions, but which they viewed in no other light than as something tangible at a distant day, when state-necessities or their's should demand its confiscation. An office was considered with regard to its emolument, and classified accordingly. We need not multiply illustrations. The hidden sense of all these things, the duties they entailed, the objects whereunto they had been appointed, were altogether placed out of view. The sign became everything, the thing signified

nothing : the instrument was regarded for its own sake, not with reference to, or in connection with, its end. Thus all things lost their meaning, and the life and vigour of the state became engulfed and swallowed up in the sands of an arid and barren formulism. It was the character of the age itself. At this day, looking back into the unspeakable turpitudes of the last century, what room there is for marvel ! It was the age of quacks and adventurers of all kinds, on the one hand, and dupes upon the other : each labouring in his own vocation, whether it were religion, law, constitution, or political economy, or any *other* department of material science, the only focus from whence these were supposed to have radiated, and towards which they were made to converge. The sense was proclaimed, by Locke and Condillac, the sole source of all knowledge. Their followers, Hume, Voltaire, and Diderot, made sense and earthly enjoyment the only end of all knowledge ; while the only means to that end consisted, as we have observed, in a conformity of the intelligence to the laws that regulate the objects of sense ; so that matter became at once the source, the means, and the end of all philosophy,—the only aim worthy of man, or about which his hopes and fears should interest themselves. Hence, when materialism in the government, insupportable to the governed, called loudly on the philanthropists for revision and amendment, the latter, as was natural for men of their fashion of mind, saw nothing in the elements of chaos that lay mouldering above, beneath, and on every side, but temporary disorders, exceptional phenomena, products of a vicious organization, which a sound *theory* of government, by its own nature and inherent force, would suffice to cure. The attractive and repulsive influences were disarranged : a paper constitution would restore the balance between them, and the state-machine would then move on as if mechanically, and without any large expenditure of wisdom or virtue on the part of the rulers. It was not that formulism and materialism were worthless and pernicious :—far from that ; they, the innovators, held them with all their hearts, and souls, and strength :—but merely that the state was not yet in possession of the true formula,—not yet under the influence of the real physical force ; and that, while a parchment patent might be a good thing, a paper constitution was decidedly better. This was the sum and substance of the measures proposed for the moral and physical regeneration of France ! As the drama proceeds, we witness farther illustrations of the same relinquishment of substance for shadow. For not only did those who came after the constitution had been born and buried, wreak their rage upon the formulas which had existed before them, as upon the causes of their unspeakable wretched-

ness, which, however, reposed on far deeper foundations ; but, again, when all had become overturned and burnt up in the fiery inundation that poured in on every side, the same infatuation, the same blindness of heart,—in a word, the same formulism,—prompted these also to recur, not to the sources of life and healthfulness, but to some of the forms in which those characteristical qualities of a sound state of polity had occasionally become manifest. Hence the “ Hereditary Representative” succeeded to the “ King;” “ Citizen to “ Noble;” and finally, “ Republic” to “ Monarchy.” Hence, too, the foolish fondness of the democratic party for the very excesses and crimes which disfigure the fairest pages of the annals where the deeds of their Grecian and Roman models are chronicled : hence the extinction of the names, the divisions of time, the festivals, which recalled to the memory the institutions of Christianity ; and the substitution of others unknown to France since the days when the Emperor Julian kept court at Paris ! Their poverty of invention in these cases was as remarkable as their narrowness of insight. It was not given to these puny deniers of supersensual influence to see, that the thing they ought to inculcate upon the people was, not the mere imitation of those outward garments wherein the spirit of man, enfranchised from matter, and enlightened from on high, hath sometimes mysteriously embodied itself so as to command the reverence of those who were prepared to await its coming, and lay hold of it when come, and by its strength to make head against the oppression, and convulsion, and anarchy, that struggled from without ; that their object, we say, was not to be the idle imitators of those cast-off forms, which, having served their temporal destiny, and now useful no longer, lay lifeless in the past, when the spirit had deserted them ; but rather to strive after the acquisition of the spirit itself,—the spirit of justice, of sacrifice, of freedom,—in whose comparison the merely political freedom is as nothing,—to renounce the domination of matter—that iron domination which had so long crushed them—to abandon sensual belief, sensual hope, sensual affection ;—and then—thus purified and prepared, but not till then—to frame for their country the means and implements of its regeneration. But not so with the little men of that day,—royalists, constitutionalists, girondins. The first, entrenched in the limits of a barren conservatism, attributed the name of loyalty to the worship of abuses, to the worse than Ghibelline, the Gallican devotion of all power, the spiritual not excepted, to the temporal power. Among the second, some were for a constitution *à l’Anglaise* (after which fashion also they chose their studs and riding-boots !), a king, lords, and commons ; others for one of a king, senate, and repre-

sentatives, *à l'Américaine*; others for a still newer *mode*, consisting in a king and commons only: being all, however, in this consentient, that they fancied the things they aped were as valuable, as if still accompanied with the manly, sturdy, high-souled excellence by which they were first called into action, and which characterized their hardy Anglo-Saxon founders in the Old and New World. Just so with the girondins, or pure democrats: with them circumstances, beliefs, moralities, were, in the provision of their own system, set utterly at nought; their constant watchword, the *Bonheur du Peuple*, in their view denoted "Sovereignty of the People," and nothing short of it; inasmuch as that popular happiness had, for a time at least, and in days of yore, been procured through the medium of Spartan, Athenian, or Roman democracies! To mere materialists, none of these conclusions could appear to be absurd: there was no way to disabuse them save by an appeal to experiment. Each nostrum had its trial, with what success we will not recapitulate. Suffice it that the self-combustion and extinction of the materialist philosophy have resulted from it: right and wrong came to be recognised "influences" after all: the disarrangement of the moral forces was witnessed to be something more dreadful in anticipation, more fatal in effect, than the disorders of the material agents in this universe: and it was seen that, as the bases of morals,—utility, rationale, pleasure, were but unsound, artificial substitutes for the real basis, religious belief. Crime, which embarrasses the influences of our world, must find, late or early, an inevitable, inexorable meed, not to be explained but on the principle of divine retribution,—be it as a Thirty Years' War, a Lisbon Earthquake, or a French Revolution! To resume: it had been denied that there was action, motion, existence even, beyond nature or the province of physical science; then Jacobinism stood forth! With that reality, her own foul creation,—materialism was confronted, and she became as one tongue-tied and conscience-stricken, as the palpable refutation rose before her sight. Henceforth her part was done: it had commenced with the destruction of religious faith; it ended here in self-destruction,—a suicidal return into the bosom of that nothing she loved so well, and out of which, an endless negation, she had just arisen!

For, while these farces had been enacted above ground, the popular substrata had not slumbered in idleness. The people had, at an early period of this era of enlightenment, caught up the goodly example of their betters, and had done their best to extinguish the Christianity within them. A heavy misery was theirs,—the misery of an unproductive soil, a bankrupt exchequer, a grinding taxation, superadded to which, and aggravating

the horrors of all beside it, was the Machiavellian policy of their infidel rulers, the unreined licentiousness of the sensualists who lorded it among them. And thus it was that, at the moment even when to the mitigation of their sufferings, and their support and solace beneath that weight of woe, all the consolations of our most holy religion seemed scarcely more than adequate, did these unhappy beings abjure and execrate that very source of comfort, and sacrilegiously scorn its sacraments, and impiously trample them under foot; yet more to be pitied in their sacrilege than their monitors, the proud ones who, at least, "living sumptuously and faring plenteously," had not, in their palliation, the maddening famine and wretchedness, the soul-piercing iron of tyranny, the starving wife and little ones, and the thousand agonizing scourges which, by day and night, laid heavy on those suffering paupers, tempting them "to curse God and die." And here we, with pride as men, and lowly thankfulness as Christians, bethink ourselves that temptations as sore, and injuries as multiplied, endured not for years only, as by the French people, but for whole centuries, failed to avert from the paths of Christian peace the faithful Irishman. In vain was the spectacle of suffering heightened and set off, by, what in the French picture is wanting, the proffers of worldly wealth and honours in exchange for a dreary lot and easy apostasy: he stood his ground,—in all things else, in fortune, liberty, perhaps in life, bankrupt and profuse,—but to this one possession bound by a tie not to be by mortal hand severed. But the commonalty of France, amid their own and the general impiety and wickedness, had an important mission to teach the nations and their rulers who depart from God, and claim to walk in the dimness of their own small policy. It was that, when these abjure the dominion of the right, then *the mights of men become their rights!* Not for their rulers,—not for the coffers of the great,—not for the selfishness and lusts of their fellow-men,—will the many brook the continuance of their hard destiny any longer than they have faith in a world to come, and the future recompense of a desertful life in this. Far less will they, while unbelievers, submit themselves in silence to the still heavier yoke prepared for them by statesmen irresponsible to men, and incredulous of God's law. Thus in France, the horrors of the lower classes, aggravated tenfold by the iron rule of their materialist governors, left them no hope from man; and of divine help their own unbelief had left them destitute. They were abandoned to their laws; and such laws! Then was shown the insufficiency of human barriers when crime has once attained to justify itself in the eyes of its victims; the feebleness of reformers who seek not the Spirit of the Most High: then came the

burning-up of formulas, the condemnation of the quacks, the self-establishment of the "mights" of mankind in the place where its "rights" were no longer recognized. Before the face of that dread phenomenon, sophism and delusion fled far away, and the naked reality dawned into view. "A truth," says Mr. Carlyle,* "came at last, clad in hell-fire; but still it was a truth!" And with the truth, there came belief in it: belief, from the sceptic and scorner! For those who had denied it before it came, and stood in visible presence before them, were, when that hour arrived, baptized unto it in a baptism of blood and fire, till scepticism became impossible. All shared in that dreadful rite; not the great ones only, who were the first to suffer, but the people themselves, who accomplished indeed their retribution, but added thereby to the load of wretchedness whose intolerable smart first goaded them into revolution. Twice came the poisoned chalice, commended by an even-handed justice to the lips of the destroyers. The Church had been the point of attack of all parties alike; but in the hands of the populace, her latest and savagest adversary, the weapon devised by autocrats against her operated their own ruin, and in its turn, the ruin of the mob itself; when the base executioners to whom the mob had at first committed it for the punishment of the great, turned it against them from whose hands they so received it. The commencement of the end was the fall of the Bastille: a narrow interval of constitution connects it with its final end and consummation—the Guillotine!

And yet all was not lost in that black anarchy. The creed, law, ritual of Christianity, remained. The Church existed, intact and intangible; Jansenism and Gallican slaveries had shorn away much of the splendour which is derivable from individual eminence of virtue and abilities; but the Church itself reposed on bases too substantial to be shaken by the breath of kings or populace. Simony, world-worship, and sacrilege, had, it is true, been sown among her palaces, by ministers like Choiseul or D'Argenson, but the plants thrived not beyond the courtly precincts. Within those precincts, what marvel that the profane blasphemed, when the very men, whom station made the assertors of Christian doctrine and discipline, were the foremost in assailing the notions and practices of those best days of the Church—the middle ages? But the ages of faith, while they were honoured with the cold detraction of such men as the Abbé Fleury, or the dignitary who wrote about *Devotion reconciled with Intellect*, nevertheless wanted not appreciation at that time. There was still the courage to do and bear, and suffer for the truth, and for the flocks which Heaven had committed to their keeping. And

* Vide his Lectures on European Culture.

when Mr. Carlyle, taking, for the clergy in general, that model of unworthy primates, Loménie de Brienne, charges the whole body of the faithful, clergy and laity, with the same aping reverence of formula, the same indifference to its spirit and significance, which characterises the rest of France at that period; when he reduces to a sordid love of tithe and benefice, the zeal of the generality of priests, and the fervour of the rest, to a dramatic and unmeaning swagger after martyrdom, which the good-humoured populace would not indulge,—we would ask him to explain to us the phenomenon, as it must doubtless seem to him, of the thousands of exiled priests,

“ Who undeprived, their benefice forsook,”—

when the constitutional hierarchy was tendered for their adhesion, by subscribing a schismatic oath. This country alone received and sheltered many thousands of these virtuous sufferers for conscience sake.* How, too, does he reconcile with the absence of healthy belief, the deadness of Catholicity within the heart, the paralysis of soul, that too real martyrdom of the faithful, as of one man, of which the traces left us in the massacre at the Carmes, in the noyades, in the fusillades, in the deportations, are assuredly too clear not to be discoverable by one of his sincerity? And if the famous revolt of the brave Vendéans has not been perfectly understood by our author, and if the object for which that gallant band strove mightily, to the well-nigh undoing of the revolution itself, has seemed so unaccountable to his intelligence, as to justify the expression of a sort of pity for their bewilderment, it is because Mr. Carlyle has refused to recognise this one fact, has shut his eyes to this truth which lay before him,—that Catholicity is the mother of action; a vital, undying, imperishable principle; not a name, a formula,—but a substantial essence, pervading all, ruling all; and not to be disregarded among this world's influences by him who seeks to know the past, or to forewarn the future! It was said by an enemy, who knew us better than Mr. Carlyle, “ As for the Papist, he can as soon not be, as not be active!”† And the return of peace and moral health to the bosom of distracted France, which we have witnessed, and, in still increasing developement, are daily witnessing, is not referrible to any human source—Code Napoléon, Restoration, or Dynasty of August—but, under God, to the struggles, and prayers, and tears of those chosen ones, of whom it may well be said, that, “ for their sakes those days were shortened ”

As to the archbishop-elect of Paris himself, we will only record

* It has been said that at one time there were as many as 20,000 of these exiles in this kingdom alone.

† Fuller's Worthies.

of him what has been left to us by his contemporary, the Abbé Barruel, a man to whose pages we direct Mr. Carlyle, if he seeks a true estimation of the majority among the French clergy that had not bowed the knee to Baal or Ashtaroth,—state-craft or libertinism. It will be seen that he, at least, was not disposed to abide by the standard of Brienne, as the measure of his own moral dignity.

“The man who best seconded in this,” (the suppression of religious orders,) “was one who had succeeded in making his very colleagues believe, that he had some fitness for government, and who ended by gaining for himself a place in the number of ministers whom ambition has rendered imbecile. This man was Brienne, Archbishop of Toulouse, afterwards Archbishop of Sens, then prime-minister, then public apostate, and now dead, amid contempt and execration. . . . Brienne, all degraded, all abhorred, as he is, is not as yet at the point of infamy he merits. It is not known that he was the friend, the confidant of D'Alembert; and that he was in the Church, just what D'Alembert might have been as Archbishop in an assembly of commissiouers charged with the reform of the religious bodies.”*

And much more to the same purport. We shall dismiss this subject by an earnest protest, as against Mr. Carlyle's views there-upon in general, so especially against his strictures on the celebrated Abbé Maury, afterwards cardinal, as wholly unjustifiable, and, indeed, unsupported by Mr. Carlyle himself with any tangible statement of facts.

The more remarkable parts of our author's work, if we can particularize any portions where all is so remarkable, are those wherein are sketched the personal characters of the great actors in the drama. This he has done with great judgment, proportionate, as it seems to us, to the rarity of character. For, as he well remarks in another place,† “a greater work was never done in the world's history by men so small.” He enumerates but three, Mirabeau, Danton, and Napoleon: we question whether the latter ought to have been included among the men of the *Revolution*; but, with that reserve, we cordially agree with him. There is a melancholy interest, as his readers have experienced, in tracing with our author the tumultuous course of thoughts and things, both good and evil, issuing from hearts like those of the two first-named, big, indeed, with greatness, and original and genuine nature, but unrayed upon by the faintest glimmer of faith, unwarmed by the least scintillation from the high altar of heaven. In them we see of what nature are man's resources when left to himself by divine abandonment; how grand, terrific,

* Barruel, *Hist. du Jacobinisme*, vol. i. p. 121.

† *London and Westminster Review*, vol. iv. p. 385.

and, withal, how ineffectual. In Mirabeau there is the indomitable energy of man, alike displayed in sorrow as in guilty joy, in labours Herculean, as in the prison-gloom; whether directed to the elevation of the people, as far as mere man could elevate such a people, or, as in his latter days, to the repression of the popular excitement, in favour of that monarchy, on which it had now somewhat too extensively encroached. There was in him the strong and self-possessing consciousness, that within himself lay the strength of purpose and the vigour of fulfilment which should achieve the end he had in view, were all the world his adversary. Light lay the dust upon his head! Among the sceptics of his day, he was the best; a man of much nature, and, as such, a vicious being not wholly without virtues, and great virtues! Not among the least of these do we set his hatred of the hypocrisy and formulism which surrounded him on every side; his clear appreciation of the moment at which any given political implement had ceased to be of use, and commenced to be an incumbrance. And let us not forget, in this investigation of the events, that, in the French Revolution, truth, perfect truth, was attained by no party; the reformers of abuses, on the one hand, made open war on faith and moral law, and, on the other, the defenders of religion and the decalogue, unhappily, whether led by circumstances, or unreflecting hostility, carried their sacred standards into the camp where the supporters of state-abuses had gathered themselves together. Thus, as in every civil war, there was on every side much that was right, much also that was wrong. It is only now, when these passions have in some sort cooled down, and the hot and cold fever-fits of revolution have been somewhat allayed, that the men of movement and of order are beginning to regard each other in the face, as men who seek to give and receive forgiveness. That an union so desirable is being brought about, wherein the Church herself is the mediatrix, we cannot doubt, when we look into the current of events that is flowing past us. In the mean time, let us, with Mr. Carlyle, regard the good and genuine that are in the Titans who have gone before us, not overlooking the evil.

“Honour to the strong man in these days who has shaken himself loose of shams, and is something. For in the way of being *worthy*, the first condition, surely, is that one *be*. Let cant cease, at all risks, and at all costs: till cant cease, nothing else can begin. Of human criminals, in these centuries, writes the moralist, I find but one unforgivable—the quack: ‘Hateful to God,’ as divine Dante sings, ‘and to the enemies of God.’

‘*A Dio spiacente ed a' nemici sui!*’*

* French Revolution, vol. ii. p. 201.

But whoever will, with sympathy, which is the first essential towards insight, look at this questionable Mirabeau, may find that there lay verity in him, as the basis of all, a sincerity, a great free earnestness, nay, call it honesty, for the man did, before all things, see, with that clear flashing vision, into what *was*, into what existed as fact: and did, with his wild heart, follow that and no other. Whereby on what way soever he travels and struggles, often enough falling, he is still a brother-man. Hate him not; thou canst not hate him! Shining through such soil and tarnish, and now victorious effulgent, and oftenest struggling eclipsed, the light of genius itself is in this man; which was never yet base and hateful, but, at worst, was lamentable, loveable with pity. They say that he was ambitious,—that he wanted to be minister. It is most true: and was he not simply the one man in France who could have done any good as minister? Not vanity alone,—not pride alone; far from that! Wild burstings of affection were in this great heart; of fierce lightning, and soft dew of pity. So sunk, bemired in wretchedest defacements, it may be said of him, like the Magdalen of old, that he loved much: his father, the harshest of all crabbed men, he loved with warmth, with veneration.

“Be it that his falls and follies are manifold,—as himself often lamented, even with tears.* Alas, is not the life of every such man already a poetic tragedy, made up ‘of fate and of one’s own deservings,’ of *Schicksal und eigene Schuld*; full of the elements of pity and fear? This brother-man, if not epic for us, is tragic; if not great, is large; large in his qualities, world-large in his destinies. Whom other men, recognising him as such, may, through long times, remember, and draw nigh to examine and consider: these, in their several dialects, will say of him and sing of him,—till the right thing be said; and so the formula that *can* judge him be no longer an undiscovered one.”

Marie Antoinette was the only one of the court party who learned to appreciate correctly the wild grandeurs of Mirabeau. His early death, however, rendered fruitless the acquisition of his powers, which that queenly woman achieved in one short interview, when her high soul and his gigantic intellect met and held intercourse together. That magnanimous woman!

“It is among the honourable tokens of this high, ill-fated heart, that no mind of any endowment, no Mirabeau, nay, no Barnave, no Dumouriez, ever came face to face with her, but, in spite of all prepossessions, she was forced to recognise it, to draw nigh to it, with trust. High imperial heart; with the instinctive attraction towards all that had any height!” †

So Danton, “the Mirabeau of the sansculottes,” as Mr. Carlyle calls him, all-fearful, all-hateful as he is, as any one must be, of fiery energy, of far-reaching foresight, who, having abjured God, and being of God forsaken, lives in a time of moral earthquake,

* “Dumont, p. 287.”

† French Revolution, vol. ii. p. 170.

social overthrow. bloody vengeance, in short, of French Revolution,—despite all this, Danton, of himself, or, at any rate, ranked among his fellows of the clubs, deserves more of sympathy, say even pitying admiration, than his brother man seems inclined to award to him. Again, we must bear in mind, that in him we witness the workings of a God-abandoned nature. At least we may say this of him, that if, in his blind fury against *all* form, he discriminated not between the temporal and eternal,—the creed and the charter; yet that neither did he, with the Robespierres and the Sièyes, attempt to set up anything instead of the ancient things he had destroyed, awaiting rather the ebb of the public feeling before he should direct his solicitude to the choice of a suitable channel. His cruelty, too, was rather one of a supposed necessity, than of choice: nay more, that necessity was real and not supposed, if the universe were such and so regulated as Danton would believe it! When *motive* was lost,—swallowed up in the blind gulphs of sensualism,—*dissuasives* became most essential; but with belief in judgment, justice, and a world to come, religious dissuasives, too, had perished: what was left him, then, but those of the secular, sensual order,—those elements which, summing up themselves, resulted in the reign of terror? Hence, and not otherwise, terror became the order of the day, at least as far as it depended upon Danton. Thus, too, he at any rate accomplished one great thing,—he rescued his country from the fangs of Brunswick, a thing which, without him, had not been done.

“Brawny Danton is in the breach, as of stormed cities and nations; amid the sweep of tenth-of-August cannon, the ruotte of Prussian gallows-ropes, the smiting of September sabres; destruction all round him, and the rushing-down of worlds: Minister of Justice is his name; but Titan of the Forlorn Hope, and *Enfant Perdu* of the Revolution, is his quality; and the man acts according to that. ‘We must put our enemies in fear!’ Deep fear, is it not, as of its own accord falling on our enemies? The Titan of the Forlorn Hope,—he is not the man that would swiftest of all prevent its so falling. Forward, thou lost Titan of an *Enfant Perdu*; thou must dare, and again dare, and without end dare; there is nothing left for thee but that! ‘*Que mon nom soit flétri*,’ ‘Let my name be blighted:’ what am I? The cause alone is great, and shall live and not perish. So, on the whole, here, too, is a swallower of formulas, of still wider gulp than Mirabeau: this Danton, Mirabeau of the sansculottes. In the September days, this minister was not heard of as co-operating with strict Roland; his business might lie elsewhere,—with Brunswick and the Hôtel-de-Ville. When applied to by an official person about the Orléans prisoners, and the risks they ran, he answered gloomily, twice over, ‘Are not these men guilty?’ When pressed, he

‘ answered in a terrible voice,’ and turned his back.* Two thousand slain in the prisons ; horrible if you will ; but Brunswick is within a day’s journey of us, and there are five-and-twenty millions yet to slay or to save. Some men have tasks—frightfuller than ours ! It seems strange, but is not strange, that this minister of Moloch justice, when any suppliant for a friend’s life got access to him, was found to have human compassion, and yielded and granted ‘ always ;’ ‘ neither did one personal enemy of Danton perish in these days.’”†—Vol. iii. p. 63.

Such was Danton, “ a truth—clad in hell-fire—but still a truth.” Yet this extraordinary man was doomed to expiate his crimes against God in the hands of that most loathsome of created formulists, Robespierre ; of him who *decreed* “ the existence of the Supreme Being ;” solemnly, *i. e.* “ in sky-blue coat, and black breeches,” inaugurating the new worship, by burning atheism in effigy of “ pasteboard steeped in turpentine !” Yet this would-be prophet, this “ Mahomet Robespierre,” as our author happily calls him, was the mean instrument whereby Danton was stricken down ; which being done, he, too, the baser criminal, rendered to the guillotine the inadequate forfeit of his own enormities. Such is man, and such the strength of his counsel !

“ Danton’s prison-thoughts were curious to have, but are not given in any quantity ; indeed, few such remarkable men have been left so obscure to us as this Titan of the Revolution. He was heard to ejaculate,—‘ This time twelvemonth, I was moving the creation of that same revolutionary tribunal. I crave pardon for it of God and man. They are all brothers Cain : Brissot would have had me guillotined as Robespierre now will. I leave the whole business in a frightful welter (*gâchis épouvantable*) : not one of them understands any thing of government. Robespierre will follow me ; I drag down Robespierre. O, it were better to be a poor fisherman than to meddle with governing of men.’”—Vol. iii. p. 355.

The work before us terminates, rightly enough, with the armed interference of Buonaparte, and the restoration of order, better known as the 13th Vendémiaire. To carry out the revolution is at present impossible ; we cannot predicate that it has even now ended ; “ like a bas-relief sculpture, it does not conclude, but merely ceases.” In the meantime, let our utilitarian readers derive a moral from their experience of that event hitherward to the present time. Belief is the one thing needful ! Without it, in vain are the governed weak, the rulers strong, property fenced and warranted by acts of Parliament, power, law, and influence, invested in its possessors ; the whole is hollow and baseless ; duty wants its motive, and action its healthfulness ; the husk and

* “ Biographie des Ministres, p. 97.”

† Ibid. p. 103.

shell of the constitution are there, but its soul and significance are forgotten. To what purpose, then, shall we preach utility, pleasure of virtue, and other *names*, being not agreed even as to what is pleasure, what utility? Why do we addict ourselves to the rights of man, and not extend our inquiries to his duties,—to the doctrine of the cross,—to the spirit of self-sacrifice,—without which his rights become identical and co-extensive with the might that is within him? Let them credit us, unless we do so, the best formula that human wit can fabricate for the world's guidance is to us a dead thing,—nay, more, a lie in action, working nought but delusions and wretchedness.

“No lie you can speak or act, but it will come, after longer or shorter circulation, like a bill drawn on nature's reality, and be presented there for payment, with the answer, *No effects!* . . . Lies, and the burden of evil they bring, are passed on, shifted from back to back, and from rank to rank; and so land ultimately on the dumb, lowest rank, who, with spade and mattock, with sore heart, and empty wallet, daily come in *contact* with reality, and can pass the cheat no farther.”*

But let us console ourselves: the new generation already presents the fruits of our fathers' sad experience. In France, that battle-field of faith and falsehood, the sensual school, is now extinct: Catholicity is now triumphant. There, as elsewhere, doubtless incredulity has appeared in its new and fascinating vesture, pantheism; but it is now, at least, a sober, teachable unbelief. In inverse ratio to the daily increase of the ranks of faith in every element of strength, we witness in those ranks the decline of that fatal Gallicanism, which, from its birth in the seventeenth century down to these days, whether existing in communion with the Holy See or out of its communion, in “*Liberties*” or in “*Pétite Eglise*,” has ever distinguished itself more for its obsequious deference to the court, than zeal for the Sovereign Pontiff. We see, too, with peculiar joy, that a better appreciation of the matters in difference has entirely removed those obstacles which political dissensions once cast in the onward path of Catholicity. While many illustrious Christians follow, with M. de Chateaubriand, the political creed of their fathers,—the middle class—whose monarchy, that of August, is emphatically said to be—Liberals nearly to a man, and the chief constituents of the famous Gardes Nationales,—have been lately shown, in the pages of a profound and impartial writer,† to exhibit to the Church her greatest hope and assurance of advancement. M. de Montalembert—a name which eulogy would but depreciate—is the acknowledged leader of a phalanx of true liberalism, foremost in the onslaughts that are daily made on the still im-

* French Revolution, vol. i. p. 94.

† *Des Intérêts Nouveaux en Europe*, par M. de Carné.

posing remains of imperial centralization. To that body we in great part owe the establishment of that splendid monument of faith, learning, and human progress, *l'Université Catholique*. The maiden-speech which, a few months after his father's death had placed him in the Upper Chamber, the Count de Montalembert delivered in his place against the *Fieschi-laws*, is a model of argument and eloquence, and was expressly founded by the noble orator himself on no other basis than the living oracles of God. To Mr. Carlyle we recommend the investigation of these matters, which, to him, may haply seem unaccountable, but unto us, who are Catholics, "the power of God, and the wisdom of God." We know his clearness of perception: we love his beautiful sincerity; and we acquit him at least of all participation in the malignity of that "conspiracy against truth," as modern history has been pronounced to be, into which, as regards more recent periods, he has been drawn, but unintentionally; but which, as regards his predecessors in that province, and their self-called histories of the Church in all her periods, remains yet an accusation, uneffaced, unquestionable. We acquit him of every thing but a too rigid fanaticism against *all* formula,—a too great hostility to *all* theory,—in themselves a kind of formulism, if he would look well into it. We cordially assure ourselves, that while

"All the conspirators, save only he,
Did that they did in envy of great Cæsar;
He only in a general honest thought,
And common good to all, made one of them!"

The limits of this article prevent us from trespassing farther on the patience of our readers, to present to them, as was our intention, a specimen of the peculiarly graphic power with which our author sketches great, stirring events. We can do no more than refer them, in particular, to the masterly delineations of the scandalous death-bed of Louis XV, and of the taking of the Bastille, in the first volume,—the slaughter of Nanci, the death of Mirabeau, and the flight to Varennes, in the second volume; and in the third, the trial of Louis, and the escape of Dumouriez into Austria. We have heard it said, that even foreigners who had witnessed the scenes he so dramatically describes, in his own free, unshackled, German accents, have declared, that all the circumstances were at once brought back to their recollection, although till then in some respects forgotten, and that, too, with a vividness and freshness of impression, as though they were the events of yesterday. We cordially recommend this book to the perusal and consideration of all our readers.

ART. V.—*Memoirs of the Life of Sir Walter Scott, Bart.* By J. G. Lockhart, Esq. London. 1838.

THE seventh and concluding volume of this interesting biography is now before the public, and the entire work fairly open to notice and remark. From the opportunities and respectable capabilities of the compiler, a good deal was expected, and, considering every thing, the expectation has, to a very fair extent, been realized. There are few subjects, perhaps none, that are more difficult to deal with successfully, than those of a biographical description. A thousand temptations and perils beset the inexperienced author, and among the chief of them, the Scylla and Charybdis of prolixity on the one hand, and too great brevity upon the other. In reading the life of an eminent man, the public will not be satisfied with a barren account of dates,—the birth, the marriage, the death, noted down as in the meagre record of a parish register—they must find details—they must pry into the minutiae of his existence, and learn if he were “a hero to his valet de chambre.” Yet, must a sound and even a timorous caution be exercised in the selection of those details, under penalty of the heavy charges of frivolity and bookmaking; and especially to be resisted is the dangerous seduction of indulging in lengthy disquisitions, and putting forward personal views and opinions, under the shield of the name and influence of the eminent individual whose life is the theme. A too considerate delicacy, or a miscalculation of the importance of certain passages and facts, will frequently lead to suppressions that deteriorate greatly the value of the biography: and equally injurious in another way, is an all-too-common easiness in yielding to the injudicious zeal of others, who would press upon the unhappy author, and upon the public, a thousand unimportant letters and communications. We are far, very far from saying that Mr. Lockhart has come unscathed through the fiery ordeal of these and other besetting difficulties and temptations, but it is only fair to remark that his task was one of peculiar difficulty, and that he has acquitted himself in a manner, generally speaking, creditable to his judgment and literary taste. We give him this modicum of praise the more readily, that we shall have, in the review of his work, to notice some grave and serious blemishes and faults.

It is with a strange mixture of feelings that we approach the consideration of the “Life of Sir Walter Scott.” Admiration for the genius of that extraordinary man, gratitude for the singular interest and amusement his writings have afforded us, and for their beneficial influence in several points upon society; these

sentiments are strangely blended and alloyed with others of a very contrary nature, excited by the faults of omission and commission, which even his partial biographer has to a small degree been compelled to allow. In the eyes of many it is flat heresy to advance any thing against the "Author of Waverley," and at the best it is a most unpopular task; yet, as one of duty in a reviewer, we will not shrink from it where necessary, at the same time that our endeavour shall be to touch as lightly as possible on what is bad, and dwell only upon what we can approve.

One of the points upon which Mr. Lockhart is justly entitled to praise is, that he has limited himself to the seven volumes before us. If the writing of biography be difficult in general, it is perhaps peculiarly so where the subject is a literary character, and above all, one of such transcendent fame as Scott. The "Great Magician," as he has been happily styled, so totally took the public by storm at first, and retained his mighty influence over them subsequently by spells of such potency, that at the present day the interest about him, and all that relates to him, is almost, if not quite, as vivid and as fresh as about other distinguished authors in the high noon of their fame. In consequence of this, a myriad of communications of all kinds relating to the subject of his work, have, as we may see by the preface, been poured in upon Mr. Lockhart—so numerous, that he has been able to give the names of but a select portion of the contributors, and yet fills two pages with the list. We make no doubt that he had by him the material to swell the work far beyond its present size, had he not been restrained by a sound discretion. Instead, therefore, of joining in the censure we have sometimes heard passed upon him for the length of his work, our only surprise is, that he has been able to compress it within its actual limits. We could have wished, however, that the discretion which is visible in the general arrangement, had been constantly exercised in the selection of the extracts that appear from time to time from the private journals of other persons who had to do with Sir Walter Scott. While many of these extracts are certainly interesting, there are also some that are decidedly the contrary, prosy and tedious in an extreme degree. The accounts of Sir Walter Scott's "*integrity*" in his younger days, in restoring to a countryman a half-guinea piece dropped by accident, and of his "soporific tendency" at church, might have been spared us, as well as various petty details of his after life that occasionally weary the reader in going through Mr. Lockhart's pages. The style of the book is in general good, though marked by not a few attempts at what is called "fine writing," and now and then an affectation of smartness bordering close upon down-

right vulgarity, and exhibited chiefly where the immediate topic has relation to politics. In some parts, however, where many writers would have given a free scope to sentimentality and moralizing, there is a simple pathos that finds its way to the heart; we allude more particularly to the account of the happy circle at Abbotsford, and the havoc death has since made among its members, and to the notice of the death of "The Minstrel's favourite child," the amiable and intellectual lady of Mr. Lockhart. The account too of Scott's own lingering and painful decline, is in many parts of great and touching interest, although on the whole there is an air of elaborateness and straining after effect, that the subject by no means required. The breaking down of a mighty intellect—the clouded and wintry close of a life that once had been all glorious sunshine, were events that needed no adventitious aid to command sympathies and regrets deep and sincere.

In addition to the expression throughout the book, of the biographer's own opinion of Scott, the concluding chapter of the seventh volume is devoted to a more special dissertation upon his character. One of the most prominent traits that are there noticed, is that which marked his whole course of life, almost from the cradle to the grave, the ambition of being the founder of a distinct branch of the "*Clan Scott*." This it was that held uninterrupted sway throughout his career;—its promptings as powerful in the midst of his greatest honours and triumphs, as when he was yet the unknown and dreaming law student. Of personal fame, Mr. Lockhart says, Sir Walter Scott thought comparatively very little; all his ideas and hopes being engrossed by the prospect of a long line of descendants, transmitting to the remotest posterity the style, title, and dignity of "Scott of Abbotsford." Such a weakness was most natural in a man of Scott's imagination and romantic turn of mind, and of all others it is the most pardonable, for there can be no doubt that the desire of realizing this "fond vision of the brain," gave some of the most powerful and constant incentives to the gigantic efforts that he made in literature. But these impulses were not productive of unmixed good, for to them also is to be attributed the recklessness of his expenditure upon Abbotsford, and his constant grasping after "more land, more land," however unfruitful the acquisition. Upon these latter topics, and also upon the singular mystery with which he shrouded his affairs from the eyes of anxious and real friends, until heavy losses rent the veil asunder, Mr. Lockhart's remarks are partial and deficient in stern justice; but the over lenity with which he treats them is natural and excusable, when we consider his close connexion with the

person whose life he has written. A better judgment, however, would have suggested silence, rather than an *attempt at extenuation* and excuse, where perhaps neither are fairly admissible. The general nature of Scott's pecuniary dealings cannot be said to reflect the brightest lustre upon his character. But it must at the same time be acknowledged, that very, very much indeed was done by him at a subsequent period towards the redemption of his faults. When the catastrophe came that he had so long endeavoured to conceal his dread of, even from himself, when the bitter consequences of his weak reluctance to examine into his pecuniary condition, came like a thunder-bolt upon him, and ruin stared him in the face, his spirit never quailed, nor shrunk from the severe retribution that was exacted from him. Mr. Lockhart thus writes of that period, and writes well:—

“ During the most energetic years of manhood, he had laboured with one prize in view, and he had just grasped it, as he fancied securely, when all at once the vision was dissipated; he found himself naked and desolate as Job. How he nerved himself against the storm—how he felt and resisted it—how soberly, steadily and resolvedly he contemplated the possibility of yet, by redoubled exertions, in so far retrieving his fortunes, as that no man should lose by having trusted those for whom he had been pledged; how well he kept his vow, and what price it cost him so to do; all this the reader, I doubt not, appreciates fully. It seems to me that strength of character was never put to a severer test than when, for labours of love, such as his had hitherto almost always been, the pleasant exertion of genius for the attainment of ends that owed all their dignity and beauty to a poetical fancy, there came to be substituted the iron pertinacity of daily and nightly toil in the discharge of a duty, which there was nothing but the sense of chivalrous honour to make stringent.” Vol. vii. p. 410.

The following passage in Scott's own diary was written when the heavy blow that was impending, had begun at length to be anticipated by him.

“ What a life mine has been!—half educated, almost wholly neglected, or left to myself; stuffing my head with nonsensical trash, and undervalued by most of my companions for a time; getting forward and held a bold and clever fellow, contrary to the opinion of all who thought me a mere dreamer; broken-hearted for two years: my heart handsomely pieced again; but the crack will remain to my dying day. Rich and poor four or five times; once on the verge of ruin, yet opened a new source of wealth, almost overflowing. Now to be broken in my pitch of pride!.....Nobody in the end can lose a penny by me, that is one comfort.”—Vol. vi. p. 164.

The blow fell, and now his manliness of spirit was put to the trial, and stood it well.

“ Things are much worse with Constable than I apprehended.....

I feel neither dishonoured nor broken down by the bad news—now *really* bad, that I have just received. I will involve no friend, either rich or poor. My own right hand shall do it..... If I am hard pressed, and measures used against me, I must use all means of legal defence, and subscribe myself bankrupt. It is the course one should at any rate have advised a client to take. But for this I would, in a court of honour, deserve to lose my spurs. No, if they permit me, I will be their vassal for life, and dig in the mine of my imagination to find diamonds, (or what may sell as such), to make good my engagements, not to enrich myself. And this, from no reluctance to be called the insolvent, which I probably am, but because I will not put out of the power of my creditors, the resources, mental or literary, that yet remain to me.—Vol. vi. p. 196–200.

The following are Mr. Lockhart's "collateral illustrations," as he terms them, of the period of distress.

"Mr. Skene, of Rubislaw, assured me that he (Sir W. Scott) appeared that evening quite in his usual spirits, conversing on whatever topic was started, as easily and gaily as if there had been no impending calamity; but, at parting he whispered, 'Skene, I have something to speak to you on, be so good as to look in to-morrow.' When Skene called, about half-past nine, next morning, he found Scott writing in his study. He rose, and said, 'My friend, give me your hand—mine is that of a beggar.' He then told him his ruin was complete, and added, 'Don't fancy I am going to brood idly on what can't be helped, I was at work on Woodstock when you came in, and I shall take up my pen the moment I get back from Court.'

"James Ballantyne's memorandum of the dark announcement, on the morning of Tuesday, 17th January, 1826, is as follows. 'On the evening of the 16th, I received from Mr. Cadell a distinct message, putting me in possession of the truth. I called immediately on Sir Walter Scott, but found he had got an unconscious respite, by going out to dinner. It was between eight and nine next morning, that I made the final communication. No doubt he was greatly stunned; but upon the whole, he bore it with wonderful fortitude. He then asked, 'Well, what is the actual step we must first take?' I reminded him that £2000, or £3000 were due that day, so that we had only to do what we must do—refuse payment—to bring the disclosure sufficiently before the world. He took leave of me, with these significant words, 'Well, James, I will never desert you.'—Vol. vi. p. 214.

There is very much more that we might extract from the sixth and seventh volumes, still farther depicting the firmness with which the shock was met, and the gallant struggle against unexpected and overwhelming difficulties; but other matters press upon our notice. We therefore take leave of this part of the subject, with only one additional remark, that, although there certainly is, throughout Scott's personal memoranda concerning the period of distress, an air of writing for other eyes than his own, (a very common fault of diaries and journals), yet his conduct to the end

proves that he was not guilty of any bravado; for he struggled even to the ruin of his constitution, and shortening of his existence, to retrieve his errors of judgment.

“He paid the penalty of health and life, in the discharge of his debts; but he saved his honour and his self respect.”—*Lockhart*. Vol. vi. p. 224.

While we bow a willing assent to many of Mr. Lockhart's reflections and observations, there are also many and grave causes of differences between us. In the concluding chapter we find the following:—

“The few passages in Scott's Diaries, in which he alludes to his own religious feelings and practices, show clearly the sober, serene, and elevated frame of mind in which he habitually contemplated man's relation with his Maker; *the modesty with which he shrunk from indulging either the presumption of reason, or the extravagance of imagination, in the province of faith; his humble reliance on the wisdom and mercy of God, and his firm belief that we are placed in the world, not to speculate about another, but to prepare ourselves for it, by active exertion of our intellectual faculties, and the constant cultivation of kindness and benevolence towards our fellow-men.* But his character has sufficiently impressed itself upon the great body of his writings. *He is indeed one of the few great authors of modern Europe, who stand acquitted of having written a line that ought to have embittered the bed of death.* His works teach the practical lessons of morality and Christianity in the most captivating form—*unobtrusively and unaffectedly.*”—Vol. vii. p. 414.

Much of this we are sorry to be compelled to deny. We have marked in the italics what we particularly object to, and will presently go into the details of the matter. There is much that he has written, which those desirous of his fame, ought to wish were blotted out for ever—much that darkens and sadly obscures that fame. It is a common charge against the “Dublin Review,” that its pages are too exclusively devoted to matters relative to the Catholic Religion. We fear we must give some additional ground to the charge, for it is chiefly with regard to that religion that we find grave cause for reprehension in the works of Scott. We poor English and Irish Catholics do certainly stand in rather an unenviable position. A large proportion of our fellow-countrymen are avowedly hostile to us on account of our religious belief, and they are hounded on by their superiors and their own clergy to assail us in every way. Meantime, we have friends—kind, condescending, patronizing friends—among the liberal portion of our countrymen. These last do not attack us *openly*—they do not *say* we are unfit to share in the full enjoyment of civil rights and immunities, nay, they have advocated a kinder treatment of us, and still continue to do so, and to express loud regrets for the persecutions to which we have been subjected.

But in their speeches, their books, their newspaper press, they indemnify themselves for this condescension, this toleration. Does a liberal member want a topic in his harangue to his constituents at one of the customary dinners during the recess of Parliament? he straightway exclaims against the No-Popery cry of his political opponents, and proclaims to the world his belief and strong conviction that the Catholics do *not* mean to set London, or even the Thames, on fire. He will then proceed to reconcile himself to his hearers, by denying that he has any affection to the *religion* of the Catholics, which he will style a "degrading superstition," or some such other sweet epithet. Of this spirit in books it is hardly necessary to speak; the literary talent of England, since the Reformation, has almost universally been employed in attacking, vilifying, and calumniating the Catholic faith; the historian, the traveller, the novelist, the poet, the writers in periodical publications, all, with one common consent, seize on every opportunity to attack, openly or covertly, right or wrong, what is elegantly termed "*Popery*." Nay, these attacks have not been confined to the talented portion alone of English writers, but every wretched scribbler, that by dint of copious and unacknowledged borrowings from the labours of others, produces a feeble attempt at history, trumps up a book of travels, or atchieves a novel in miserable and servile imitation of Scott; takes his fling at the religion of his ancestors, and all the more readily, that he knows nothing in the world about it, save the foul calumnies of which it has been the object. The spirit that prompts these attacks is as active in the present year, 1838, as in the worst times of the persecution of the last century; the same unfairness—the same virulence—the same *ignorance crasse* of most of the real rites and tenets of the ancient Church being displayed now, as then. The press, even at this very moment, the *liberal* press, (of course we speak not of "*The Times*," that paper whose very name fouls the mouth, nor of the other organs of Tory calumny and falsehood,) treat all that relates to the faith of Catholics as fair game, and indulge themselves and their correspondents in strictures of a disparaging and even insulting nature, without the slightest appearance of consideration for the feelings of the Catholic portion of their readers. *The Morning Chronicle*, liberal and enlightened in many respects, publishes letter after letter from its veracious and not at all biassed "*Correspondent in Berlin*," misrepresenting the disputes now between the tyrannical monarch of Prussia and the Catholic Church; and the stupid calumnies with which those letters are occasionally seasoned, are punctually copied and commented upon in the liberal papers of the evening. One of these, however,

and one that has been a serious offender very recently in the respects we mention, has made as it were *amende honorable*, and to the full. We will quote the words, at once declaring our intention, (which must be by this time pretty obvious), to digress for a short space from our immediate subject, at the same time that we shall do so as briefly as possible. It has long been our intention to notice the manner in which the press usually treat all that relates to Catholicity in general, and while remarking upon the conduct in this respect of so distinguished a writer as Sir Walter Scott, it may not perhaps be deemed an unfit opportunity, to remark on the conduct of writers of an inferior order.

We have said, that one of the evening papers has made to the Catholics the *amende honorable*, and we are bound to add, to a most satisfactory degree. We only hope that this is not a passing gleam of sunshine. *The Sun*, the paper to which we allude, has the following remarks in its criticism upon the last number of the *Dublin Review* :

“ Though personally detesting all theological controversy, as the bane of Christian charity,—of that brotherly love which should glow in the heart of every believer in the leading doctrines of religion, we do not blame the Catholics for occasionally retorting, with interest, upon their political traducers. Their’s is a warfare of self-defence, and therefore in every respect justifiable. They are the aggrieved, not the aggressors. This, after all, is not, generally speaking, the result of any deliberate malice on the part of their assailants. The truth is, that they cannot help it. This may sound oddly in the ears of some persons ; but we will make the fact intelligible to their common-sense in a moment. In what way can our young Divines convince the world that they know any thing about dogmatic theology, and are therefore fit and proper persons for preferment ? Why, by exposing some lurking deformity—latent, or *invented*, in the doctrines of the Church of Rome, to be sure. The reading of a schoolboy would suffice for an attack on more modern sectaries ; but to write about the tricks of monks and nuns in the 12th and 13th centuries—the very idea is irresistible ! Then suppose any number of mistakes—all of *course unintentional*—relative to the doctrines and practices of the Church of Rome, excessive zeal for the triumph of the reformation in Ireland, is always an ample and justificatory apology. The true test of that evangelical sanctity which never fails to befriend a young aspirant for preferment in the State Church, is less a love of God, than a hatred of the Pope. Then, as regards the converts from the Church of Rome, who so foully abuse her ; their slanders are intended as a peace-offering, which they are expected to lay upon the altar of their new faith, in proof alike of their sincerity, their good sense, and their entire community of sentiment with the Church of their adoption. We can readily imagine the existence of converts of a far different stamp. We can suppose men of a delicacy so refined, as to shrink, with a feeling approaching to horror,

from an invitation to test the strength of their new convictions, however sincere, by defiling the shrine before which they bowed in homage to their Creator, in the innocent idleness of an infant heart. Lonely must have been the hearth that fostered the growth of the Irish convert to Protestantism, who can without reproach designate as idolatry the simple piety that prompted the nightly family recital of the *Padreen Parlaugh*, notwithstanding its inclusion of the widely denounced invocation of the Virgin. For ourselves, we envy no convert from any form of Christian worship—and much less from a religion so mixed up with venerable associations as the Catholic—those feelings which manifest themselves in a virulent attack upon that faith, whose principles formed the first lesson of maternal love. We can distinguish between simple conversion, the result of long, deep, and patient enquiry, and that harlequin zeal that spurns the ashes, and dishonours the memory of the dead, in order to pass current for a suitable atonement for errors." *Sun*, May 17, 1838. .

In the foregoing remarks we recognize the dawn of a better spirit towards the Catholics and their religion, and gladly do we hail it. It is a relief after the long course of insulting toleration and calumnious liberality with which we have been treated. The practice has been too long in vogue to suffer every affront to Catholics to pass in silence, and to reprove writers of that class, when they venture the slightest retort. *All* was fair towards us, but we were not to be permitted even a passing epithet. It is but the other day that *The Examiner* took the Catholic, Mr. Waterton, to task, because, in the introduction to his recent delightful work upon *British Ornithology*, he ventured to allude to Martin Luther as "the apostate friar." Yet was this epithet no more than the truth, for surely it is not denied that Luther broke through solemn vows, and not only abandoned the faith of his youth, but became its leading assailant.

How true—how deeply true, is this passage in the extract we have quoted:—"The real test of that evangelical sanctity which never fails to befriend a young aspirant for preferment in the State-church, is *less a love of God, than a hatred of the Pope!*" Also, most true the writer's statement, that the Catholics are engaged in a "warfare of *self defence*." We are forced to be polemical, if we would not be deemed spiritless; but the moment the attack upon us shall cease, the writer in *The Sun* may be assured all tendency on our part to "*hot controversy*" will disappear. What hateful bickerings, a thousand times worse than any thing that has as yet been witnessed, would there not be, if the Catholics at length suffered themselves to be goaded into retort, with the ample grounds for recrimination and abuse that they consider themselves possessed of! But the forbearance they have hitherto shown, they will still continue to show, although getting as little credit for it as ever. There is nothing

dearer to Catholic hearts, than the anticipation of that blessed time they hope for yet, when religious disputes shall cease to break up the charities of life, and interfere with the common struggle of man, to benefit his kind.

Another notice of the CATHOLICITY of the *Dublin Review*, we meet in the *Athenæum* weekly journal.

“ The *Dublin Review*, the accredited organ of the Irish Catholics, and the eighth number of which is just published, is taking more decidedly the colour of its vocation. We are better pleased with it on that account. In the abstract, it is true, we dislike the literature of religious parties, for it tends to narrow the intellect, and corrupt the heart. But since such things must be, we think it best that men should speak out, and declare themselves for what they are. We are more especially pleased at seeing the Catholics take their place openly in the ranks of religious freedom, as men daring to display the reasons for the faith that is in them. Too long has oppression driven the Catholic party upon a course of mystification. Their writings have not reflected what they thought, but what it was expedient to declare. This “ *Jesuitry*,” as it has been called, is the armour with which nature protects the downtrodden and the helpless. The result of long habits of caution and timidity was manifest in the writings of Catholic Britain, and to our ear was singularly displeasing. We rejoice at the change of tone. ‘ Possessing a strong confidence in the truth of our own religious creed, which is not Roman Catholic, we are well pleased to witness the spread of the universal truths of science and philosophy, on the other side of the channel, although bound up in the inveterate green cover of a political dissident.’ ”

There is a candour and a fairness in much of the foregoing, which will not be the less appreciated by the Catholic body, because they are quite unaccustomed to being dealt with in such a manner. We cannot, however, quite agree with all of it, as we do not rightly comprehend what the writer had in his mind, when he accused the Catholics of a tendency to “ *mystification*.” It is to be regretted that some specific instance was not here advanced; we would at once have admitted it, if it were true. It is a heavy charge to say that Catholic writings have not reflected what the writers thought, but what they deemed *expedient* to put forth. Surely some proof ought to have accompanied such an assertion. The epithet of “ *Jesuitry*,” too, sounds grating to the ear, as an adoption of the old cant terms of bigotry,—calumnious, if not meaningless. The words “ *Jesuitry*,” “ *Jesuitical*,” it has been the custom among Protestant writers, to apply to conduct that savoured of meanness, intricacy, and artfulness; and this because such they affected to consider were the distinguishing characteristics of the celebrated society of Jesuits. None but those who are obstinately prejudiced, and shut out from the advantages of education and information, now really

believe that that society ever contained aught within itself, or ever did any thing, but what was beneficial in the highest degree to the human kind; and it is time that the old by-words of bigotry and intolerance, should be blotted from the language. There may have been occasional instances on the part of the Catholics of overcaution and imbecile timidity, but there are many and strong circumstances of extenuation, and this much must be granted, that the conduct and writings generally of the long and deeply injured Catholic body, have been those of men quietly, but steadily and determinedly, seeking to assert themselves, while they sedulously avoided all that could give to others any rational grounds for offence. We will terminate our digression with saying, that all professors of the much abused religion in question, have reason to be grateful for the two articles we have quoted, for they breathe a better spirit than usual, and hold out some hope that henceforward, even in the anxiety to deprecate political opposition, or to turn a pretty sentence in a newspaper paragraph, the feelings of Catholics will be remembered and respected.

We have said that we dissent from Mr. Lockhart's opinion, that Sir Walter Scott never wrote a line that he ought to have regretted, and we have stated that the chief point that causes the difference between us is, the conduct of that gifted writer towards the Catholics and their religion. Towards the Dissenters, indeed, Scott was frequently and grossly uncharitable; but towards those who held by the ancient faith of Christendom—that faith which, were it but for its antiquity, might have been expected to command, at the least, *respect*, from so warm a lover of all that was *old*, he was most particularly and pre-eminently so. It is therefore strange to read in the extract we have quoted a few pages back, of the “*modesty* with which he shrunk from *indulging in the presumption of reason*,” and his “*constant cultivation of kindness and benevolence* towards his fellow-men.” And while, with most deep earnestness and sincerity, we trust and hope, that in his painful and lingering death-illness, he was saved by the blessed powers of repentance, from the pangs of remorse for unmerited injury and obloquy cast and confirmed upon others, we must altogether deny that Sir Walter Scott was, as Mr. Lockhart says, “one of the few great authors who stand acquitted of having written a line that *ought* to have embittered the bed of death.” For many errors and mistakes attributable to him, there are excuses good and sufficient; but for the especially adverse, unfair, ungenerous, and *calumnious* tenor, towards his Catholic fellow-countrymen, of his writings, there is, and can be, *no* excuse. His enlightened and cultivated mind,

his active and piercing intellect, could not have been mastered, save with the consent of his will, by the foul and debasing prejudices among which he was born. In no part of his seven volumes does Mr. Lockhart find fault with the subject of his biography upon this score, but on the contrary, coincides thoroughly, and *defends*, where he deems defence at all necessary.

“ Though no man disapproved of Romanism as a system of faith and practice, more sincerely than Sir Walter Scott always did, he had, long before the year 1825, formed the opinion that no good could come of protracted resistance to the claims of the Catholics to be admitted into Parliament. He on all occasions expressed manfully his belief that the best thing for Ireland would have been, never to have relaxed the strictly *political* enactments. Had they been kept in vigour for another half century, it was his conviction that Popery would have been all but extinguished in Ireland. But he thought that after admitting Romanists to the elective franchise, it was a vain notion that they could be permanently or advantageously debarred from using that franchise, in favour of those of their own persuasion.”*—(Lockhart,) vol. vi. p. 70.

In what a light does the above exhibit Sir Walter Scott! Here we behold the man of enlarged and powerful intellect,—the man described to us as full of all the better and higher feelings of our nature—in short, as a character than whom none ever had “ *fewer faults*,” (vol vii. p. 410)—here we behold him yielding, in advanced life, an ungracious and reluctant assent to a measure opposed bitterly by him in the prime of his life,—a scanty and most impefeet measure of justice, to a long and cruelly oppressed body of his fellow-Christians; and yielding that assent, not because of the holiness and beauty of universal toleration—not impelled by the promptings of philanthropy,—but *because farther resistance was useless!* And we are farther informed, that he *regretted the repeal of the Penal Laws!*—of those laws, the very mention of which ought to make every

* Mr. Lockhart introduces this statement in his account of what he styles “ the only *incivility*” Sir W. Scott received in Ireland. This was the refusal of Mr. John O’Connell (brother of the hon. M.P. for Dublin,) to give a stag-hunt at Killarney, in honour of the great novelist, as was Mr. O’Connell’s custom, towards all distinguished visitors of the celebrated lakes. We have made it our business to enquire into the facts, and have been informed that this refusal was *not* based on the real or supposed aversion of Sir W. Scott to the granting of Catholic emancipation, as Mr. Lockhart says it was; but upon his virulent bitterness of hostility *generally* to the Catholic religion, and the base perversion of his talents to the slander and defamation of that religion. In proof of this, although Miss Edgeworth’s *want of sympathy*, to say the least, for Catholic disabilities and privations, was well known, yet, as her hostility was, at any rate, not *active*, a respectful offer was made at that time to *her*, of a stag hunt, which, however, she declined.

We confess we wish other Irishmen had imitated Mr. John O’Connell’s example, and shewn that they would not lick the foot that spurned them. There then would have been no grounds for the Glasgow Baillie’s sneer to Mr. Lockhart, on the warm reception given to Scott in Dublin, that “ *yon was owre like worshipping the creature.*”

man that has a heart, blush for his kind, to think that such a combination of injustice, cruelty, perfidy and plunder, should ever have emanated from beings calling themselves human! But there is a miserable saving clause we had nearly overlooked, in Mr. Lockhart's statement. We are told it was the "*strictly political*" enactments of those laws, which Scott would have wished to have seen still in force. We are not, however, told which these are; they ought to have been specified; the distinction between them, and the rest of the provisions of the hateful code, is rather too nice and fine for our unassisted judgment. In a country where the enjoyment of the elective franchise itself—that first and all-important step towards admission into the constitution,—depends upon the possession of property, the clauses that forbade, or impeded, the acquirement or fruition of property were surely as political in character, as even that which forbade Catholics to sit in Parliament. And the whole code was devised, with a wicked ingenuity, that rendered each and every part mutually dependant, while all were subservient and conducive, (in different degrees indeed, but still directly and indisputably), to the working out of the one great end, the annihilation of the political existence of those who held to the tenets of the Church of Rome. A stone removed from the hideous edifice, ensured the tumbling down of the rest. This the Parliamentary bigots of the year 1778, (the first year of relaxation) distinctly saw, and therefore did they violently oppose the progress of concession at the very first step. But if we were in doubt as to what "Status" of the Penal Laws, Sir W. Scott looked fondly back upon, there is an extract from his diary of the year 1829, that gives more information on the subject than his biographer has chosen to impart. In p. 180 of the seventh volume, we find that it was to the Penal Laws as they existed before 1780. Now let us examine in what state they were, at the commencement of that year. The statute book is our authority, and in it we perceive that up to that time there had been two occasions on which they had been meddled with. We were going to write two *relaxations*, but the first of these "meddlings, (as no doubt they were styled and deemed by the Lockharts of the day), went no farther than to enable Catholics to swear allegiance to their sovereign, and in no way mitigated the existing severities. This was the 13th and 14th George III. c. 35. The second "*meddling*," and first relaxation, took place in the year 1778, by the passing of an Act entitled, "An Act for the relief of his Majesty's subjects of this kingdom, professing the *Popish* religion." We may remark in passing, that the epithet we have marked in italics, is but an early specimen of the petty attempts at insult,

that down to this day, are coupled with every profession and every act of liberality towards the Catholics, and that are thrown in as salvos to Protestant consciences. The 17th and 18th George III, c. 49, enacted, that any Catholic subscribing the oath of allegiance and declaration, required by the former Act, (13th and 14th Geo. III) might take leases for 999 years certain; and that the lands then possessed by Catholics, should in future be descendible, deviseable, or alienable, as fully as if in the hands of Protestants. It also prevented the child, who should declare himself a Protestant, from demanding maintenance from his father, out of his personal estate, or depriving him totally of the inheritance of his real estate, as the child could have done by the Act of Queen Anne. So far there was good, but very small was the amount, compared with the evil that remained unrepealed. Still the Catholics could not have, nor acquire, any *freehold* interest—still the barbarous enactments against their clergy, and the free use of their religion, remained on the statute book, as did also those which obstructed, impeded, and had been designed to crush education among “the Papists;” and those which shut out the unfortunates who came under that denomination from all places of power and emolument,—from grand juries, from being sheriffs, or sub-sheriffs, from commissions in the army or navy; in fine, from the highest situation in the state, down through all the ranks of society,—even so low, (such was the minuteness, and almost absurd baseness of the exclusion), as the humble post of a “*gentleman’s gamekeeper*.”

This, then, is the state of things regretted by Sir Walter Scott. With this before us, we must question the claims so boldly advanced for him, to any very surpassing benevolence of disposition. The man who could entertain for a moment, much less cherish, and in proud and scornful terms avow, a regret that such a state of things should not have been suffered to continue in all its baseness and atrocity, cannot have had the happiness of his fellow-creatures very strongly at heart. It is in vain to tell us after this, that, “If ever the principle of kindness was incarnated in a mere man, it was in him.” Not conceding the praise of great benevolence, neither are we inclined to rate very highly his philosophy, when we find him advocating and predicting success from the continuance of laws which had been tried, and had so utterly and notoriously failed of their object. His religious feelings have been much vaunted, yet what avail and value can there be in outward professions and observances, when the blessed spirit of charity breathes not its holy influence within. Are the following passages emanations from that

blessed spirit, or are they not from a far different, nay, an opposite source?—

“The Catholic is holding up his head now in a different way from what they did in former days, though still with a touch of the savage about them. It is after all, a helpless sort of superstition, which, with its saints’ days, and the influence of its ignorant bigoted priesthood, destroys ambition and industrious exertion I hold Popery to be such a mean and depraving superstition, that I am not sure I could have found myself liberal enough to vote for the repeal of the penal laws, as they existed before 1780. They must, and would, in course of time, have smothered Popery; and I confess I should have seen the old lady of Babylon’s mouth stopped with pleasure. But now that you have taken the plaster off her mouth, and given her free respiration, I cannot see the sense of keeping up the irritation about the claim to sit in Parliament. Unopposed, the Catholic superstition may sink into dust, with all its absurd rituals and solemnities. Still, it is an awful risk. The world is, in fact, as silly as ever, and a good competence of nonsense will always find believers. Animal magnetism, phrenology, &c. &c., have all had their believers, and why not Popery?”—Vol. vi. p. 84; vol. vii. p. 180.

We will not trust ourselves to remark upon these and similar sentiments and expressions. It would have shewn a better judgment, a greater consideration for the fame of his hero, (consideration for the feelings of the Catholic portion of the public, was, *of course*, out of the question), if Mr. Lockhart had omitted the passages we have quoted, and many similar in the other volumes. There surely was no necessity to increase the odium that is the well-earned meed of Sir Walter Scott’s conduct towards the Catholics and their religion. Of his demerits upon this head, he himself displayed some consciousness, when, on his visit to Rome, in one of the last sad months of his life, he expressed wonder at the kindness of his reception, by those upon whose religion he had flung obloquy. Two in particular of his novels would seem to have been especially and peculiarly devoted to the foul and anti-Christian purpose of perpetuating and increasing ignorant bigotry and base prejudice, by misrepresenting and calumniating the faith of so many of his fellow-countrymen, and of the majority of the Christian world. The “*Monastery*,” and the “*Abbot*” are the two novels to which we allude. We had intended to make extracts from them, but the task is too disgusting, were there a sufficiency of space to do so. Suffice it to say, that almost every mean and shameful calumny that was ever spawned forth by the demon of low, malignant, inveterate, and envious bigotry, is adopted throughout their pages; and the man who scrupled not to wish for the abhorred penal laws, as a means to ensure the spread of the Protestant

faith, *dared* to throw upon Catholics the old exploded calumny of caring nothing for the means, provided the end were good!

It would have been well, we have said, if his biographer had dwelt as lightly upon as possible, or omitted altogether, all notice of Scott's offences against charity; but Mr. Lockhart has judged otherwise. Still, it might have been hoped that he would have accompanied their recital with some expressions of disapprobation and regret, for the grievous faults that his scrupulosity, as a historian, compelled him to notice. There is, however, nothing of this in his pages; on the contrary, it is but too evident that Sir Walter Scott's conduct and opinions as to all appertaining to Catholicism, had his biographer's full approval, and have been deemed by him worthy of adoption and imitation. There is strong evidence of this throughout his work, given in every possible way; especially in the constant use of his favourite designation for the Catholic religion, which, adopting the low *slang* of his party, he generally styles "*Popery*." Sometimes a little variety is to be found, as in such sentences as the following:—"We had partaken liberally of '*Catholic*' hospitality in Ireland, but had not met with one single specimen of the '*Romish*' priesthood, although even at '*Popish*' tables, we met with dignitaries of the Established Church." Why a person who aspires to be a correct and elegant writer, should use three different epithets to designate what appertained to *one* religion, we cannot say—save that it must proceed from low bigotry, that sought opportunity to insult his fellow-christians. With regard to the fact he mentions, that during the tour of Sir Walter Scott and his friends in Ireland, they did not meet with Catholic clergymen, even at "*Popish*" tables, we can very readily and very easily account for it, by supposing that the tables in question were those of a certain portion of the Catholic body who court and *fawn upon* their bitter enemies, and affect distaste and disgust towards those of their own communion—a class of men whom their countrymen regard with a loathing and a contempt beyond words, in which they are heartily joined by the violent bigots who suffer the slaves to fawn and crouch around them.

We are quite prepared, if our remarks should reach the eyes of the liberal press, for a repetition of the charge brought against the *Dublin Review*, of its too exclusive devotion to the advocacy of Catholic sentiments and opinions. Our accusations against the great novelist and his biographer, will be treated as an ebullition from the wounded spirit of "*Popery*;" to be passed over in silence. Yet, do we earnestly disclaim any motive in our remarks, save that of asserting the principles of universal toleration, and freedom of conscience from insult and calumny, less

endurable than physical outrage. Had the Dissenters been attacked in the same way that we have, our reprobation would have been to the full as loud and as continued. The liberal editors, who, in such a case, would have spoken out themselves, would have found us agreeing with them in condemning such attacks. But they are silent when it is only *Popery*—the common target,—that has been shot at ; and not only are they silent, but they think we ought to be so too.

“ He hath disgraced me—laughed at me—*scorned my nation*—thwarted me—cooled my friends—heated mine enemies ; and what is his reason ? I am a Jew. Hath not a Jew eyes ? Hath not a Jew hands, organs, dimensions, senses, affections, passions ? Fed with the same food, hurt with the same weapons, subject to the same diseases, healed by the same means, warmed and cooled by the same winter and summer, as a Christian is ? ”

Substitute “ *Catholic* ” for “ Jew, ” and Protestant for Christian, and the foregoing is a complaint that well might come from a “ *Popish* ” mouth. The Catholic to this day is, in reality, even more outlawed than the Jew. It is quite lawful, and quite allowed, to jeer him—to insult him—to calumniate him ; but it is “ *bad taste* ” to avail himself of the only organ open to those of his creed, to repel the foul attacks of their open enemies, and the ungenerous insinuations and contemptuous liberality of their professing friends.

Of Scott’s general politics Mr. Lockhart thus speaks :

“ Of his political creed, the many who hold a different one, will of course say that it was the natural fruit of his poetical devotion to the mere prejudice of antiquity ; and I am quite willing to allow that this must have had a great share in the matter, and that he himself would have been as little ashamed of the word *prejudice*, as of the word *antiquity*. ’

“ He was on all practical points a steady conscientious Tory, of the school of William Pitt, who, though an anti-revolutionist, was certainly any thing but an anti-reformer. He rejected the innovations, in the midst of which he died, as a revival, under alarmingly authoritative auspices, of the doctrines which had endangered Britain in his youth, and desolated Europe throughout his prime of manhood. May the gloomy anticipations which hung over his closing years be unfulfilled ! But should they be so, let posterity remember that the warnings, and the resistance of his, and other powerful intellects, were probably in that event the appointed means for averting a catastrophe in which, had England fallen, the whole civilized world must have been involved. ”—Vol. vii. pp. 412-413.

The last sentence we cannot say that we comprehend ; we are not aware of the precise nature of the “ *catastrophe* ” which the warnings of Sir Walter Scott and his resistance averted. He

cried out loud against the Reform Bill, and resisted by every means in his power the struggle to carry it; yet that "catastrophe" occurred. What then is the "catastrophe" that has been averted? We confess we cannot make out: unless Mr. Lockhart means, by that epithet, the then threatened disfranchisement of the freemen in towns. *That* certainly *was* averted; the profligacy and infamous corruption of that body exist to as great an extent as ever; but we were not aware till now that Sir Walter Scott was instrumental in preserving to them their right of selling their consciences and themselves. Nor were we cognizant of the full importance "to the whole civilized world," of the perpetuation of bribery and corruption in England; and although now at length enlightened upon these points, we fear we must decline to join in Mr. Lockhart's jubilation upon the immunity of the wretches who put themselves up for the highest bidder at the elections in Stafford, in Norwich, in Ipswich, in Leicester, in Liverpool, and other places of equally infamous notoriety in that respect.

Sir Walter Scott's politics did not constitute the fairest, or most creditable side of his character. If the truth must be said, he was in them, as in his opinions upon religious matters, a fixed inveterate bigot, without the miserable apology of limited capacity, or bluntness of perception. It is true, that he was born amongst the basest prejudices, and his early youth was passed within their atmosphere, and therefore it is not to be wondered at, if the first bias of his mind was towards illiberality. But his was not an intellect to be hoodwinked, save with his own consent, when it had reached its maturity; and neither when he first became able to judge for himself, nor at any subsequent period of his life, did he ever seek to emancipate his mind from the foul trammels of those prejudices. Towards those who politically differed from him, he never showed generosity or consideration, or the slightest symptoms of any other feeling than bigoted and ruthless enmity. While the childish fancy for "soldiering" that he displayed on all occasions, whether on an unfounded rumour of French invasion, or equally groundless report of the rising in arms of (in his own phrase in his diary) "fifty thousand blackguards" in Northumberland, will amuse the reader, very different feelings will be excited by the perusal of the various passages in which he exposes his political leanings and persuasions. One specimen of these will be more than enough. Using the term "Whiggery," to denote liberality in politics, he says, (vol. iv. page 128,)

"As for Whiggery in general, I can only say, that as no man can be said to be utterly overset until his rump has been higher than his head,

so I cannot read in history of any free state which has been brought to slavery, until the rascal and uninstructed populace had had their short hour of anarchical government, which naturally leads to the stern repose of military despotism. Property, morals, education, are the proper qualifications for those who should hold political rights, and extending them very widely, greatly lessens the chance of these qualifications being found in electors. Look at the persons chosen at elections where the franchise is very general, and you will find either fools who are content to flatter the passions of the mob, for a little transient popularity, or knaves who pander to their follies, that they may make their necks a footstool for their own promotion. With these convictions I am very jealous of Whiggery, under all modifications, and I must say my acquaintance with the total want of principle in some of its warmest professors, does not tend to recommend it."

The "rascal and uninstructed populace," the "mob;" gentle terms these, and well prefaced by the coarseness of the first sentence. The matter of the foregoing diatribe too, is quite consistent with the manner. Morals, it would appear, are to be found only in conjunction with property; the vast majority of the people *must* be immoral, for they are *poor*, and assuredly in this country poverty is a crime. We cannot but admire the off-handed severity of the remarks upon "persons chosen at elections where the franchise is very general," not a single word being added of comment upon those chosen at elections of a contrary description. No allusion to the faults and misdeeds of the latter—to *their* love of station—to *their* base flattery and subserviency—to *their* profligacy and corruption. And in proclaiming the "total want of principle," which he announces that he detected in "some of the warmest professors of Whiggery," he is totally silent as to similar discoveries among the professors of his darling Toryism. Perchance he deemed the fact of a deficiency of principle among the latter, only too obvious and long known.

Without wishing to delay longer than can be helped upon the unpleasant topics we have discussed, we cannot avoid some notice of his opinions upon Ireland. With our unfortunate country he had little sympathy; his education (we had almost said his nature) forbade it.

"In sober sadness, to talk of the *misery* of Ireland at this time, is to speak of the illness of a *malade imaginaire*. Well, she is not, but she is rapidly becoming so. There are all outward and visible tokens of convalescence. Every thing is mending; the houses that arise are better a hundred fold than the cabins which are falling; the peasants of the younger are *dressed* a great deal better than with the rags which clothe the persons of the more ancient Teagues, which realize the wardrobe of Jenny Sutton, of whom Morris sweetly sings:—

"One single pin at night let loose
The robes which veiled her beauty."

“ But this, which seems to me to have been generally the attire of the fair of the green isle, probably since the time of King Malachi, and the collar of gold, is now fast disappearing, and the habit of the more youthful Pats and Patesses is decent and comely. *Here* they all look well coloured, and well fed, and well contented. And as I see in most places great exertions making to reclaim bogs upon a large scale, and generally to improve ground, I must needs hold that they are in constant employment.”—*Letter to Mr. Morritt, August 1825.*

First impressions they say are not always to be trusted, and the above were *his* first impressions. A few months later he writes thus in his diary, commenced November in the same year.

“ I was in Ireland last summer, and had a most delightful tour. There is much less of exaggeration about the Irish than might have been expected. Their poverty is not exaggerated ; it is on *the extreme verge of human misery* ; their cottages would scarce serve for pigsties, even in Scotland—and their *rags seem the very refuse of a ragshop*, and are disposed with such ingenious variety of wretchedness, that you would think nothing but some sort of perverted taste could have assembled so many shreds together. You are constantly fearful that some knot or loop will give way, and place the individual before you in all the primitive simplicity of Paradise. Then for their food, they have only potatoes, and too few of them.”

Mr. Lockhart thus describes the Irish tour:—

“ It was a succession of festive gaiety wherever we halted ; and in the course of our movements we saw many castles, churches, and ruins of all sorts, with more than enough of mountain, wood, lake, and river, to have made any similar progress in any other part of Europe, delightful in all respects. But those of the party to whom Ireland was new, had almost continually before them spectacles of abject misery, which robbed these things of more than half their charm. Sir Walter, indeed, with the habitual hopefulness of his temper, persisted that what he saw, even in Kerry, was better than what books had taught him to expect ; and insured that improvement, however slow, was going on. But ever and anon, as we moved deeper into the country, there was a melancholy in his countenance, and, despite himself, in the tone of his voice, which I for one could not mistake. The constant passings and re-passings of bands of mounted policemen, armed to the teeth, and having quite the air of highly disciplined soldiers on sharp service,—the rueful squalid poverty that crawled by every way side, and blocked up every village where we had to change horses, with exhibitions of human suffering and degradation, such as it never had entered into our heads to conceive ; and above all, *the contrast between these naked, clamorous beggars, who seemed to spring out of the ground at every turn, like swarms of vermin, and the boundless luxury and merriment surrounding the thinly scattered magnates who condescended to inhabit their ancestral seats*, would have been sufficient to poison those landscapes, had nature dressed them out in the verdure of Arcadia, and art embellished them with all the temples and

palaces of old Rome and Athens. It is painful enough even to remember such things; but twelve years can have made but a trifling change in the appearance of a country which, so richly endowed by Providence with every element of wealth and happiness, could, at so advanced a period of European civilization, sicken the heart of the stranger by such widespread manifestations of the wanton and reckless profligacy of human mismanagement, the withering curse of feuds and factions, and the tyrannous selfishness of absenteeism; and I fear it is not likely that any contemporary critic will venture to call my melancholy picture overcharged. A few blessed exceptions,—such an aspect of ease and decency for example, as we met every where on the vast domain of the Duke of Devonshire,—served only to make the sad reality of the rule more flagrant and appalling. Taking his bedroom candle one night, in a village on the Duke's estate, Sir Walter summed up the strain of his discourse, by a line of Shakspeare's, "Sweet mercy is nobility's true badge:"—Vol. vi. pp. 66, 67.

It must have been real misery, indeed, that moved the sympathies either of Sir Walter Scott, or of his biographer, identified as both were, and as the latter is still, so utterly and completely, with a party to whom the very name of Ireland is an abomination. To draw "tears from Pluto's iron cheek," is but a parallel achievement to winning from such partizans as Mr. Lockhart one word of kindness towards Ireland. There is a good deal of truth in his observation, that twelve years have not effected much change in the appearance of that unfortunate country. No very great change could be expected, "while the wide-spread manifestations of wanton and reckless profligacy, of human mismanagement, the withering curse of feuds and factions, and the tyrannous selfishness of absenteeism," of which he speaks, continue to this day, kept up and fostered by the malignant and determined opposition given, by one branch of the Legislature, to all measures of improvement and amelioration of the condition of Ireland and of her people. But one change, Mr. Lockhart would find, though perhaps he would be very reluctant to acknowledge it. There is no longer occasion for the incessant parading of heavily armed policemen—riot and disorder now hide their diminished heads. The present administration have soothed Ireland,—though with her wounds yet bleeding, her miseries yet unrelieved—to repose—the repose of generous confidence in the first symptoms of kindness and *real* anxiety for her welfare. Nor has that confidence been up to this time disappointed. All that lay in the power of a beneficent government to do for her relief has been done, and if that all be but little, the people of Ireland fully perceive with whom the fault lies; they fully know how the best measures and the best intentions of their rulers are defeated by that branch of the Legislature to

which we have before alluded. Mr. Lockhart, however, would be very reluctant to give to the government that keeps his party from place and power, any credit for their conduct towards Ireland.

In concluding our hasty notice of Sir Walter Scott's observations upon the country just named, we congratulate our fellow-countrymen upon the involuntary and repeated expression of admiration of herself and her resources, that was rung from even him, during his visit to her shores. On one occasion, (in his letter dated October 1825, to Joanna Baillie), he predicts, that "despite all the disadvantages which have hitherto retarded her progress, she yet will be the queen of the trefoil of kingdoms." He adds: "I never saw a richer country, or, to speak my mind, a finer people." In a subsequent portion of the letter, the Irish reader will be much amused at the idea Sir W. Scott formed of the importance and physical strength of the Orangemen of Ireland. He seems to have swallowed all their vauntings with the greatest ease. To one who knows Ireland, and knows what a miserable stand the Orange party could make there, did matters really come to the bloody arbitrement that party professes so much to desire, those vauntings are subjects but of contemptuous ridicule. The Orangemen are strong and bold, only while the people of Ireland are forbearing and patient. Once let the people of that country believe that there is no farther hope for them but in arms, and the hateful faction that boasts so loud, would be crushed in a day.

We very gladly turn from the exciting topics we have been treating upon, to the more pleasing parts of the work before us. The chief of these are, the very interesting personal memoranda and diaries from the pen of Scott himself. In the introduction to the work, the first of them is thus announced:—

"In obedience to the instructions of Sir W. Scott's last will, I had made some progress in a narrative of his personal history, before there was discovered, in an old cabinet at Abbotsford, an autobiographical fragment composed by him in 1808, shortly after the publication of *Marmion*.

"This fortunate accident rendered it necessary that I should altogether remodel the work which I had commenced. The first chapter of the following memoirs, consists of the Ashestiel fragment; which gives a clear outline of his early life, down to the period of his call to the bar, July 1792. All the notes appended to this chapter are also by himself. They are in a hand-writing very different from the text, and seem, from various circumstances, to have been added in 1826."

Accordingly, the autobiographical fragment written in 1808, and annotated in 1826, leads the van of the personal memoirs we

speak of; but although possessing very considerable interest, it has an appearance of premeditation and carefulness, that rather take away from the pleasure its perusal would otherwise give. The same fault is much less discernible in the "fragment" next in order, and which we deem the best written in the book—his diary of, (to give it his own title), "A Voyage in the Light House Yacht, to Nova Zembla and the Lord knows where—vacation 1814." In July of that year, he received an invitation from the Commissioners of the Scottish Light Houses, to accompany them in their tour of inspection round the north coast, and he at once accepted of it, although, at the time, yet ignorant of what would be the reception by the public of the first of his novels, and perhaps the best, if a selection can be made among so many of such surpassing excellence. While upon this tour, which he seems to have much enjoyed, he collected materials, as Mr. Lockhart informs us, (and, indeed, as is abundantly evident) for some of the notes of his poem, *The Lord of the Isles*, and especially for his romance of *The Pirate*. On perusing this diary, we are continually reminded of the fine descriptions and piquant scenes of that novel. We cannot read the following without thinking of Mordaunt Merton's stormy journey from Burgh Westra, and the hard struggles of Triptolemus Yellowley with the rude agriculturists of the northern islands.

"As we are to dine at Gardie House, the seat of young Mr. Mowat, we resolve to walk across the island about three miles, being by this time thoroughly wet. Bressy is a black and heathy isle, full of little lochs and bogs. Through storm and shade, and dense and dry, we find our way to Gardie, and are most hospitably treated. Young Mr. Mowat, son of my old friend, is an improver. He has got a ploughman from Scotland, who acts as *grieve*, but as yet, with the prejudices and inconveniences which usually attach themselves to the most salutary experiments. The ploughman complains that the Zetlanders work as if a spade or hoe burnt their fingers, and that though they only get a shilling a day, yet the labour of three of them does not exceed what one good hand in Berwickshire would do for 2s. 6d. The islanders retort, that a man can do no more than he can; that they are not used to be taxed to to their work so severely; that they will work as their fathers did, and no otherwise; and at first, the landlord found great difficulty in getting hands to work under their Caledonian taskmaster. Besides, they find fault with his '*ho!*' and '*gee!*' and '*wo!*' when ploughing. 'He speaks to the horses', they say, 'and they gang; and there's something no canny about the man.' In short, between the prejudices of laziness and superstition, the ploughman leads a sorry life of it. An old-fashioned Zetland plough is a real curiosity. It had but one handle or stilt, and a coulter, but no sock; it ripped the furrow therefore, but did not throw it aside. It was dragged by four little bullocks yoked abreast, and as

many ponies harnessed, or rather strung, to the plough by ropes and thongs of raw hide. One man went before, walking backward, with his face to the bullocks, and pulling them forward by main strength. Another held down the plough by its single handle, and made a sort of slit in the earth, which two women, who closed the procession, converted into a furrow with their shovels. This and many other barbarous habits to which the Zetlanders were formerly wedded, seem only to have subsisted, because of their amphibious character of fishermen and farmers.'—Vol. iii. p. 153.

The Triton-like appearance of the elders among the population of the northern isles, the inhuman conduct sometimes practised along those wild coasts towards seamen in distress—the rumours of the monstrous Kraken hovering in the Offing—the sword dance of the Isle of Papa, are all duly commemorated in the diary, as in the novel. The seamen of the Greenland fishery who frequently visit those islands, were, it appears, the models after which he depicted the lawless crew of *Fortune's Favorite*.

“Lerwick will suffer most severely, if the fort be not occupied by some force or other; for, between whiskey and frolic, the Greenland sailors will certainly burn the little town. We have seen a great deal, and heard much more of these gentry. A gentleman at Lerwick, who had company to dine with him, observed beneath his window, a party of sailors eating a leg of roast mutton, which he witnessed with philanthropic satisfaction, till he received the melancholy information that that individual leg of mutton, being the very sheet-anchor of his own entertainment, had been violently carried off from his kitchen, spit and all, by these honest gentlemen. Two others having carried off a sheep, were apprehended and brought before a magistrate. The first denied he had taken the sheep, but said he had seen it taken away by a fellow with a red nose and a black wig—(this was the justice's description.) ‘Don't you think he was like his honour, Tom?’ added he, appealing to his comrade. ‘By —, Jack,’ answered Tom, ‘I believe it was the very man.’”

Scott's companions upon the voyage remarked afterwards, on reading the *Pirate*, that he carefully confined himself in it to the description of those places he had himself visited. The following will show how he adhered to this rule, in the case of one of the finest descriptions of the novel:—

“We beat down to Sumburgh-head, through rough weather. This is the extreme south-eastern point of Zetland; and as the Atlantic and German Oceans unite at this point, a frightful tide runs, called Sumburgh *roast*. The breeze contending with the tide, flings the breakers in great style upon the high broken cliffs of Sumburgh-head. They are all one white foam, ascending to a great height. We went ashore with various purposes,—I ascended the head by myself, which is lofty, and commands a wild sea-view. Zetland stretches away, with all its projecting capes and inlets, to the north-eastward. Many of those inlets approach each other very nearly; indeed, the two opposite bays at Sum-

burgh-head seem on the point of joining, and rendering that cape an island. The two creeks from those east and western seas, are only divided by a low isthmus of blowing sand, and similar to that which wastes part of the east coast of Scotland. It has here blown like the deserts of Arabia, and destroyed some houses, formerly the occasional residences of the Earls of Orkney. The steep and rocky side of the cape which faces the west, does not seem much more durable. These lofty cliffs are all of sand-flag, a very loose and perishable kind of rock, which slides down in immense masses, like avalanches, after every storm. The rest lies so loose, that, on the very brow of the loftiest crag, I had no difficulty in sending down a fragment as large as myself: he thundered down in tremendous style, but splitting upon a projecting cliff, descended into the ocean like a shower of sharp shot. The sea beneath rages incessantly, among a thousand of the fragments which have fallen from the peaks, and which assume a hundred strange shapes. At the foot of the ascent, and towards the isthmus, is the old house of Sumburgh, in appearance a most dreary mansion."—Vol. iii. pp. 168-9, &c.

Among the notices (of which there are several) of Sir Walter Scott, at various periods of his life, by others than himself or his biographer, a very interesting one is of him at home at the end of the year 1824. It is from the pen of one who has attained a very fair share of reputation as a pleasing writer upon other subjects, Captain Basil Hall, and though marked by his besetting sin of too great "*spinning out*," will well repay perusal. Mr. Lockhart's discretion in inserting such contributions has not always been so well shown. In the first volume, several pages are taken up with an exceedingly tedious and gravely frivolous account of Scott as a boy, while under the tuition of Mr. James Mitchell, a Presbyterian minister. Among other important facts communicated by the writer, (the Rev. Mr. Mitchell himself), we learn, that "Master Walter" was of "a soporific tendency" during sermons at Church,—probably when his tutor was the preacher, but we are *not* informed if this was the case. Another extraordinary fact narrated by Mr. Mitchell is, that his young charge, upon finding a half-guinea on the ground, had not only the sagacity to suppose that it had been dropped by a person standing near, but the honesty to enquire of the person had he lost any thing, and on his replying in the affirmative, to restore to him the money he had dropped.

Captain Hall thus presents to us the great novelist, in what the latter used sometimes to style his "own baronial castle of Abbotsford."

"Abbotsford, December, 1824.

"Had I a hundred pens, each of which at the same time should separately write down an anecdote, I could not hope to record one-half of those which our host, to use Spenser's expression, 'welled out alway.'

To write down one or two, or one or two dozen, would serve no purpose, as they were all appropriate to the moment, and were told with a tone, gesture, and look, suited exactly to the circumstances, but which it is, of course, impossible, in the least degree, to describe. . . . *Dec. 30th.*—This morning, Major Stisled, my brother, and I, accompanied Sir W. Scott on a walk over his grounds, a distance of five or six miles. He led us through his plantations, which are in all stages of advancement, and entertained us all the way with an endless string of anecdotes, more or less characteristic of the scenes we were passing through. Occasionally he repeated snatches of songs, sometimes a whole ballad, and at other times, he planted his staff in the ground, and related some tale to us, which, though not in verse, came like a stream of poetry from his lips. Thus, about the middle of our walk, we had first to cross, and then to wind down the banks of the Huntly Burn, the scene of Old Thomas the Rhymer's interview with the Queen of the Fairies. Before entering this little glen, he detained us on the heath above till he had related the whole of that romantic story, so that by the time we had descended the path, our imaginations were so worked upon by the wild nature of the fiction, and still more by the animation of the narrator, that we felt ourselves treading upon classical ground. . . . On reaching an elevated point near a wild mountain lake, from whence we commanded a view of many different points of his estate, and saw the progress of his improvements, I remarked that it must be interesting to engage in planting. 'Interesting!' he cried, 'you can have no idea of the exquisite delight of a planter; he is like a painter laying on his colours,—at every moment he sees his effects coming out. There is nothing comparable to this; it is past, present, and future enjoyment. I look back to the time when there was not a tree here, only bare heath: I look round, and see thousands of trees growing up, all of which, I may say almost each of which, have received my personal attention. I remember five years ago looking forward with delight to this very hour, and, as each year has passed, the expectation has gone on increasing. I do the same now; I anticipate what this plantation and that one will presently be, if only taken care of, and there is not a spot of which I do not watch the progress.' . . . It is impossible to touch for an instant upon any theme, but straightway he has an anecdote to fit it. 'What is the name of that bright spot,' I said, 'on which the sun is shining, just there in the line of Cowdenknowes?' 'That,' said he, 'is Haxel Cleugh. I was long puzzled,' he added, 'to find the etymology of this name, and inquired in vain on every hand to find something suitable. I could learn nothing more than that, near the Cleugh, there was a spot which tradition said had been a Druidical place of worship. Still, this did not help me. At length, as I was reading very early one fine summer's morning, I accidentally lighted upon a passage in some German book, which stated that Haxa was the old German term for a Druidess. Here, then, was the whole mystery solved; and, wild with impatience to tell it to some one, I mounted up-stairs to my wife's room, where she was lying fast asleep. I was well aware she neither knew nor cared one jot about the matter; that did not signify; tell it I must to some one immediately; so I roused her up, and though

she was very angry at being awakened out of her comfortable doze, I insisted on bestowing my beautiful discovery upon her. Now don't you understand this?' he added, turning to me. 'Have you not sometimes, on board your ship, hit upon something which delighted you, so that you could not rest until you got hold of some one down whose throat you might cram it—some stupid dolt of a lieutenant, or some gaping midshipman, on whom, in point of fact, it was totally thrown away;—but still, you had the satisfaction of imparting it, without which half the pleasure is lost.' . . . *Abbotsford, Jan. 8, 1825.*—It is wonderful how many people a house can be made to hold upon occasions such as this (the coming home of Sir Walter's eldest son). By one or two o'clock we were the only guests left, and on the great unknown proposing a walk, we gladly accepted his offer. I have never seen him in better spirits. . . . It is very difficult, I may say impossible, to give a correct conception of his manner by mere description. . . . We had anecdotes of Tom Purdie, his gamekeeper and factotum. . . . Sir Walter wished a road made through a belt of trees. 'Tom,' said he, to his right-hand man, 'you must not make this walk straight, neither must it be crooked.' 'Deil! sir, what then maun it be like?' 'Why,' said his master, 'don't you remember when you were a shepherd, Tom, the way in which you dandered home of an even? You never walked straight to your house, nor did you go much about: now make me just such a walk as you used to take yourself.' . . . I have never seen any person on more delightful terms with his family than is Sir W. Scott. The best proof is the ease and confidence with which they all treat him, amounting quite to familiarity. Even the youngest of his nephews and nieces can joke with him, and seem at all times perfectly at ease in his presence; his coming into the room only increases the laugh, and never checks it—he either joins in what is going on, or passes."—Vol. v. pp. 375-6, 380, &c.

Mr. Lockhart bears corroborative and very ample testimony to the excellence of Sir Walter Scott's private character; and says of him, with, as we believe, much truth, that he was "a patient, dutiful, and reverent son; a generous, compassionate, and tender husband; and an honest, careful, and affectionate father." Of his conduct towards his children, the best evidence is, the strong confidence and affection that existed between him and them. But, to use Mr. Lockhart's words,—

"Perhaps the most touching evidence of the lasting tenderness of his early domestic feelings, was exhibited to his executors, when they opened his repositories in search of his will, the evening after his burial. On lifting up his desk, we found, arranged in careful order, a series of little objects, which had obviously been so placed there that his eye might rest on them every morning before he began his tasks. These were the old-fashioned boxes that had garnished his mother's toilette, when he, a sickly child, slept in her dressing-room; the silver taper stand which the young advocate had bought for her with his first five-guinea fee; a row of small

packets inscribed with her hand, and containing the hair of those of her offspring that had died before her; his father's snuff box and etui case; and more things of the like sort, recalling 'the old familiar faces.'

"The same feeling was apparent in all the arrangements of his private apartment. Pictures of his father and mother were the only ones in his dressing-room. The clumsy antique cabinets that stood there (things of a very different class from the beautiful and costly productions in the public rooms below), had all belonged to the furniture of George's Square. Even his father's rickety washing-stand, with all its cramped appurtenances, though exceedingly unlike what a man of his very scrupulous habits would have selected in these days, kept its ground. The whole place seemed fitted up like a little chapel of the Lares."—Vol. vii. pp. 411-12.

We reluctantly abstain from adding to our extracts some of the early notices of Scott, which we would very gladly insert, but that they would tend to swell this paper to an unreasonable bulk. We would earnestly direct our readers to the interesting details connected with his boyhood and early manhood, when he was devouring all manner of old books and legendary lore, and unconsciously acquiring that singularly varied and extensive stock of information, that he so profusely developed in his after days. The story of his "*raids*," too,—the first into Northumberland, forming, as it did, the groundwork for Darsie Latimer's wild rambles in *Redgauntlet*; the repeated visits to Liddesdale, the country of stout Dandie Dinmont; the journey into Stirlingshire and Perthshire, and his first acquaintance with the Highlands, that he has made classic ground; these also must we reluctantly forego: neither have we space to review the circumstances attending the births, in brilliant succession, of the splendid productions of his genius;—his extraordinary rapidity and facility of composition;—the eager activity of his mind, that sought no rest save in change of labour;—the "gallant composure," as Mr. Lockhart says, "with which, when he dismissed a work from his desk, he awaited the decision of the public, and the healthy elasticity of spirit with which he could turn his whole zeal upon new or different objects. For all these, we are compelled to refer our readers to the volumes before us; and their admiration will be much increased, and their interest painfully heightened, when they come to the distressing details of his later years, and behold him, enfeebled by disease, and pressed by misfortune, gallantly continuing, and even increasing, his gigantic efforts; no longer with the delight of *voluntary* labour, and cheered along by fair visions of fame, but as a stern task of duty, to clear off the crushing load of debt incurred by his wild imprudence. Those efforts aided and increased the ravages of the cruel disease that at length hurried him to the grave. And

if one thing were wanting to complete the picture, it is supplied by the fact that, after two apoplectic attacks had been added to his sufferings, he steadily laboured at, and finished, his last novel, *Count Robert of Paris*, amid the disapprobation and discouragement of those who had formerly applauded and cheered him on.

Early in August, 1831, having concluded *Count Robert of Paris*, and its companion, *Castle Dangerous*, he at length yielded to the recommendations of his physicians to seek a milder climate, where to pass the winter. At the instance of Captain Basil Hall, Sir James Graham, then first lord of the Admiralty, obtained leave from the late king, to place at Sir Walter Scott's disposal a frigate, to convey him to the Mediterranean. At this time, a delusion, which no one could wish to have seen dispelled, had come over the broken-down invalid, and his reluctance to leave his home was much lessened by the belief now fixed in his mind, that his pecuniary embarrassments were all cleared off, and at an end.

On the 29th October, he embarked in the *Barham* frigate, and, after a fine and pleasant passage, reached Malta on the 22nd of the succeeding month. At that island, as everywhere else upon his journey, he was received and treated with every honour and distinction. From thence he proceeded to Naples, and here, notwithstanding his promises to his physicians, and his increasing debility, he insisted on resuming his pen. In company with Sir William Gell (whose account of their rambles Mr. Lockhart copies), he visited all the Neapolitan objects of interest; but he speedily wearied of sight-seeing, and an earnest longing began to possess him to get back to home once more. As opposition to his wishes only caused excitement deemed most injurious, his companions yielded; and in May, 1832, after a hasty visit to Rome, the homeward journey was begun. "The rest of the story," Mr. Lockhart says, "cannot be too briefly told." The "irritation of impatience" to get home, hourly increased, and he passed with indifference the objects worthy of seeing upon his route, all his anxiety being to get on. On the frontiers of Holland he sustained another stroke of apoplexy, and from that hour was unable to walk.

Embarking at Rotterdam, he reached London on the 13th of June; and after a stay of about a month, his constant yearnings for Abbotsford induced his physicians to consent to his removal thither. In a state of apparent torpor he was removed on board the steam-boat for Scotland; and in the same state he continued, until, after being landed at Newhaven, he was approaching his long-desired home.

"As we rounded the hill at Ladhope, and the outline of the Eildon-hills

burst on him, he became greatly excited ; and when turning on his couch, his eye caught at length his own towers at the distance of a mile, he sprang up with a cry of delight. . . . After passing the bridge of Melrose, the road for a couple of miles loses sight of Abbotsford, and he relapsed into his stupor ; but on gaining the bank immediately above it, his excitement became again ungovernable. Mr. Laidlaw was waiting at the porch, and aided us in lifting him into the house.—He sat bewildered for a few moments, and then resting his eye on Laidlaw, said, ‘ Ha ! Willie ! O man, how often have I thought of you ! ’ By this time his dogs had assembled about his chair,—they began to fawn upon him and lick his hands, and he alternately sobbed and smiled over them, until sleep oppressed him. . . . He desired to be wheeled through his rooms, and we moved him leisurely for an hour or more, up and down the hall and the great library. ‘ I have seen much,’ he kept saying, ‘ but nothing like my ain house ; give me one turn more ! ’ He was gentle as an infant, and allowed himself to be put to bed again, the moment we told him we thought he had had enough for one day. . . . On Monday he remained in bed, and seemed extremely feeble ; but on Tuesday was again wheeled about on the turf. Presently, after dozing for about half an hour, he started up, and shaking the plaids off his shoulders, said : ‘ This is sad idleness, I shall forget what I have been thinking of, if I don’t set it down now ; take me into my own room, and fetch the keys of my desk.’ He repeated this so earnestly, that we could not refuse ; his daughters opened his desk, and laid pen and paper in the usual order, and I then moved him through the hall, and into the spot where he had been always accustomed to work. When the chair was placed, and he found himself in the old position, he smiled and thanked us, and said, ‘ now give me my pen, and leave me for a little to myself.’ Sophia put the pen into his hand, and he endeavoured to close his fingers upon it, but they refused their office,—it dropped upon the paper. He sank back among his pillows, silent tears rolling down his cheek. . . . ‘ Friends,’ said he, ‘ do not let me expose myself, get me to bed—that is the only place.’ . . . After this he declined daily, but still there was great strength to be wasted, and the process was long. He seemed, however, to suffer no bodily pain, and his mind, though hopelessly obscured, appeared, when there was any symptom of consciousness, to be dwelling, with rare exceptions upon serious and solemn things ; the accent of the voice, grave, sometimes awful, but never querulous. . . . Commonly, whatever we could follow him in was a fragment of the Bible, or some petition of the litany, or some of the magnificent hymns of the Romish ritual, in which he had always delighted. We very often heard distinctly the cadence of the ‘ *Dies Iræ*,’ and I think the very last stanza that we could make out, was of a still greater favourite :—

‘ Stabat mater dolorosa,
Juxta crucem lacrymosa
Dum pendebat Filius.’

. . . “ About half-past one P.M., on the 21st September 1832, Sir Walter breathed his last, in the presence of all his children. It was a beautiful

day—so warm, that every window was wide open,—and so perfectly still, that the sound of all others most delicious to his ear, the gentle ripple of the Tweed over its pebbles, was distinctly audible as we knelt around the bed, and his eldest son kissed, and closed his eyes.”—Vol. vii. chap. 11.

Peace be with him is our earnest prayer. We have spoken hardly of him, because it was our duty so to do, where he was guilty of offence unmerited and inexcusable, yet have we gladly given praise and credit where we could. Will the public decide fairly on the conduct of his biographer, who has brought into evidence all that was offensive, and endeavoured to add a sting to each insult? Had he adopted a different course, how gladly would we have joined unreservedly in the general commendation of the extraordinary man whose history he has written. But Mr. Lockhart has left us no choice, and has preferred the gratification of partizan hatred, to the conciliating of all suffrages in favour, and admiring remembrance of “the great magician of the north.”

ART. VI.—*La douloureuse Passion de Notre Seigneur Jesus Christ, d'après les Méditations d'Anne Catherine Emmerich, Religieuse Augustine du Couvent d'Aguetenberg à Dulmen, morte en 1824.* 8vo. Paris. 1835.

IN looking at the date of the above work, our readers may perhaps be disposed to reproach us with a want of zeal in laying before them the productions of the foreign press. We beg leave, however, to inform them, that this delay is not to be attributed to neglect, having been the result of a deliberate intention. The present is no ordinary question of literary criticism, but one which reposes upon principles of a higher order; and before we ventured to enter upon a subject so delicate in its nature, and so complex in its various bearings, we thought it prudent to allow the public opinion to manifest itself in France and Germany, and in Belgium, the countries in which this work has been extensively circulated. The *Meditations* of Sister Emmerich having met with the general approbation of the superior clergy and of the most eminent literary men who have occupied themselves in the study of the mystical philosophy, we think the time is arrived to lay them before the *Catholic reader* in this country. That our Protestant friends, who, we are happy to say, are not a few in number, may not take offence at our *exclusiveness* on this occasion, we hasten to explain, that the reason of the above distinction, is to be found in the method which we have adopted in

examining this question, which, instead of being treated upon a more general principle, has been confined within the limits of Church authority and Catholic tradition, premises which we have no right to call upon our separated brethren to adopt.

A belief in the existence of the invisible world, and a certain anxious desire to penetrate its marvellous secrets, have at all times formed a prominent feature in the history of humanity. This feeling varies extremely in different ages and in different persons, and we are prepared to allow, that certain individuals of our own day may very fairly put in their claim, as representatives of the minimum. We can, however, by no means admit, that in any case it amounts to an absolute negation. The most busy, vulgar, matter-of-fact personage, passes through certain phases of existence, in which the visible world being, as it were, for a moment eclipsed, the invisible glooms dimly in the uncertain distance. The fact is, we are all of us so completely absorbed in the details of every-day life, so occupied with the miserable scramble after what we consider our due share of wealth, of fame, of honour, or of pleasure, that we live habitually unmindful of an order of things upon which all visible existences depend. These habits, and their corresponding opinions, ossify the heart, and that circumstance may very well account for the extinction of an order of ideas, which constitutes man's especial dignity, inasmuch as it identifies him with beings of a nature superior to his own, and with the Deity himself.

In offering our remarks on the work which stands at the head of this article, and which, under the modest title of a book of *Meditations*, is in fact a book of *Visions*, it becomes necessary to enter into some general considerations as to the nature of our relations with things invisible, and, at the same time, to examine by what means the prudent and sober-minded may judge the origin and nature of those exceptional phenomena by which they are occasionally laid open to us; so that every one may assure himself that he is neither the victim of a deluded imagination, nor led away by the incoherent ravings of a disordered brain.

It is not to be supposed that in an institution so essentially spiritual as the Catholic Church, its divine head would omit to correct the sensual tendencies of its members, by manifesting, from time to time, and to chosen witnesses, the wonders and glories of that *invisible world*, which is the archetype and ultimate object of the world in which we live; the *visible world* having been called into being, to manifest, according to a peculiar mode, and in an imperfect degree, the glories of the *invisible*. St. Paul establishes *the visible* and *the invisible* as a fundamental antithesis throughout his writings, and frequently uses these terms

as synonymous with *heaven* and *earth*. It pleases, then, the divine head of the Church to draw aside, from time to time, the veil of the flesh, and to lay open to our astonished view the wonders of the spiritual world. Holy writ presents several examples of this nature in the early history of the Christian Church. The first, in order of time, was the transfiguration of our Divine Redeemer on Mount Thabor, and the glorious apparition of Moses and Elias. Of the disciples on this occasion, there were present only Peter, James and John, a circumstance not to be disregarded, because these favours always seem to imply a certain *personal* fitness. At a later period, St. Stephen, at the hour of death, had opened to his mortal sight the vision of the celestial city, with the Son of Man seated on the right hand of power; and St. Paul himself was favoured with a vision, upon the nature of which he guards a certain reserve. Visions, indeed, are generally shrouded in mystery, on account of the insufficiency of human language, and the limited nature of the human faculties. St. Paul, in his own case, was in the greatest uncertainty as to the *mode* of perception. He was ravished into the third heaven, but he knew not whether he was *in the body* or *out of the body*, and he saw things which it was not lawful to express. From an attentive consideration of these three visions, compared with cases of a similar nature, which are met with in the history of the Church in later ages, we discover a general law, which is, as it were, the fundamental condition, not only of those special favours, but also of the spiritual life itself, and which consists in certain necessary relations between *glory* and *suffering*. In the case of the three favoured disciples, the brilliant vision of Mount Thabor was closely followed by the awful scenes of the garden of Gethsemane, where they were particularly selected from the rest to accompany their Lord in his agony. St. Stephen's favour was followed by a violent death; and in the case of St. Paul, there was sent a messenger of Satan to buffet him. As regards our Lord himself, we are taught that his passion was the *necessary* preliminary of his glory. Hence his saying to those for whom had been requested the place of honour in his kingdom, *Canst thou drink of the cup of which I shall drink?*

The perceptive faculty in man being limited, in order to make place for the *invisible*, it is necessary to eject the *visible*, an operation of considerable difficulty, when effected by the efforts of the human will, but which has, nevertheless, been reduced to a system by ascetic writers, at the head of which, as regards this matter, we may place St. Teresa and St. John of the Cross. It is by no means our intention to show by what various progressions our corrupt nature is rendered apt to behold those things

which are independent of time and space, and which, by an imperfection of language, we qualify by a negative epithet, calling them *in-visible*, as in fact essentially opposed to objects of sense. We shall merely observe, that this is frequently effected by the special intervention of supernatural power, as in the case of private revelations.

The phenomena which accompany private revelations of the invisible world, are extremely various. One of the most striking is that subversion of the ordinary law of gravity, by which the human body remains for a considerable time suspended in the air, a circumstance by no means uncommon in the lives of holy men; and another still more general, is the total interruption of all sensibility. This suspension of the ordinary laws of nature, as regards the perceptive faculties, appears, at first sight, to establish a certain relation between the extatic state, and those extraordinary phenomena which, of late years, have much occupied the curious, under the name of Animal Magnetism.

The reader, however, will do well to bear in mind, that, in the great struggle between the powers of light and darkness, the principle of evil has always attempted to counterfeit those miraculous interruptions of the established order of nature, which are regarded as the sanction of a divine mission. When Moses performed before Pharaoh the most astonishing prodigies, the magicians of his court contrived to repeat most of them by the aid of their diabolical art. What was the natural result of this rivalry on the minds of Pharaoh and the learned Egyptians of that day? They concluded that Moses operated by the same agent as the magicians; in a word, that he was merely more profoundly versed in their art. It was indeed reserved for the philosophers of our day, to ascribe to some unknown law of nature things in themselves *physically* impossible. The prodigies operated at a later period by the same perverse spirit, had no other object than to throw a sort of discredit on the divine favours which Almighty God has vouchsafed to his more favoured servants in all ages. The superficial observer confounds the one with the other, or both of them, with the extraordinary and unknown laws of nature. Not so the Christian philosopher. He knows that there are natural and supernatural causes, ever operating; and that amongst the latter, some are good and some are evil. He pretends not to draw an exact line of demarcation between them; the Church alone, in which is invested the supreme authority in such cases, having a right to determine what is natural and what is supernatural, and amongst the latter causes, to pronounce as to the good or evil of their origin. As this right

is rarely exercised, individuals are left to form their own opinions upon the principles of ordinary investigation.

As the case of Sister Emmerich has been treated by some persons as a case of natural somnambulism, we feel peremptorily called upon to present a few general remarks upon the subject of animal magnetism,* in order to establish the essential difference which exists between celestial and demoniacal phenomena;

* In a former article (*Dublin Review*, No. VII. Art. viii.) we treated on the subject of animal magnetism in its physical relations; and the result of our investigations was a disbelief of the truth of the greater part of the alleged *magnetic facts*, and our conviction that such of the phenomena as we believe to be founded on fact, are explicable by means of acknowledged principles of medical science. The observations in the text on this subject are made on the supposition that its alleged facts are true, and to investigate the principles on which alone, in our opinion, those facts, if true, can be explained consistently with the truth of religion. We should deem it superfluous to recur to the pretensions of mesmerism as a science, were it not that the supporters of this extraordinary delusion continue to circulate the most unbounded and incredible stories of its miraculous powers. It is possible that some might be misled by the boldness of these assertions; and, therefore, it may not be amiss to make a few additional remarks to what we have before advanced. As for the mesmerists themselves, we consider that they have so completely discarded common sense and sound philosophy, in favour of credulity and prejudice, that no arguments, however strong, would have the least effect in shaking their belief. Their faith has all the character of the grossest superstition, which it is in vain to attack by any process of reasoning.

The question, then, which we have to deal with, resolves itself into two considerations. Of these, one refers to the reality of the facts; the other to the probability of their cause. In other words, do any such phenomena really occur? and if so, are we justified in ascribing them to this new, subtle, invisible, all-powerful and imponderable matter, called animal magnetism? It is important to bear in mind, that these two considerations are perfectly distinct; for it does not by any means follow, that because we admit the facts, we must therefore admit the agency assumed for their production. We may have fifty hypotheses to account for any moral or physical event, although of the event itself we may not entertain the least doubt.

Now, as to the reality of the facts, we wish, in the first place, to remove a common objection. Nothing is more frequent than to hear the advocates of mesmerism assume a bold and triumphant tone, and say, "Come and judge for yourselves, and you will find it impossible to doubt. We only ask you to credit the evidence of your own senses." This, no doubt, has every appearance of liberality, and appears to put the matter in the fairest possible manner. But we should be glad, in the first place, to have it settled how far our senses are to be trusted, and whether we are to believe every impression, however contradictory to common sense and common experience, without the strictest investigation. The remark has often been made, that false facts abound much more than false theories in philosophy; and, undoubtedly, to be a good observer of facts requires so many qualifications united, that nothing is more rare than to find one. But, if we are bound to believe every thing that we do not happen to be able to explain, how are we to regard the illusions of natural magic (as it has been termed), which can only be explained on scientific principles, and, consequently, can never be made level to vulgar capacities? Nay, even the tricks of jugglers and common mountebanks would, upon this principle, deserve our firm credence, although every one is convinced of the absurdity of such a proposition. We take it that the rule in all such cases, is to be sceptical in proportion to the improbability of events, and still more so if any such events should happen to border on an impossibility, or depend on the testimony of persons incompetent to observe, or who have a manifest object in deceiving. In fact, it has been the uniform fate of all such impostures to yield before a thorough investigation. The signal discomfiture of M. Berna in France we have already related; and notwithstanding Dr. Elliotson, in our country, has

and to that end, we shall proceed to lay before the reader some of the strange and apparently well-authenticated facts observed by persons who have written upon animal magnetism, most of

been more wary, and has declined the investigation of a committee, unless he himself should be present on the spot, enough, and more than enough, has transpired to establish the fallacy of all his facts.

Mr. Mayo has recently put forth a series of papers in the *Medical Gazette*, which he modestly hopes "may contribute to rescue this singular enquiry from the general contempt into which the credulity, ignorance, folly, and roguery of some of its advocates have forced it, and to place it within the domain of common sense and legitimate enquiry." In our former observations on this subject, we felt a good deal restrained in the comments which we then thought it necessary to make on Mr. Mayo's and Dr. Elliotson's proceedings; for, as men of science, we considered they were entitled to respect. Their advocacy of mesmerism appeared to us in no more serious light, than that of a sort of plaything, or, if more, at least we were disposed to attribute it to a constitutional precipitancy of disposition, for which we knew these gentlemen to be remarkable; and, therefore, from a feeling of delicacy, abstained from the language of censure, lest we should inadvertently injure their reputations as practical men. Our charity, however, has turned out to have been misplaced. These gentlemen have not been content with going the whole hog, as our friends the Americans express it, but have, again and again, obtruded and forced themselves on the public attention,—Dr. Elliotson, by his public exhibitions at the North London Hospital (which, by-the-bye, we are happy to observe, have recently been suppressed by an order of the governors), and Mr. Mayo, by becoming the chronicler to Dr. Elliotson, in a succession of papers to the *Medical Gazette*, which he has tricked out in all the garb and pomposity of philosophy.

In an extract from one of these papers, which we have cited above, it is plain to perceive a tone of the most perfect self-complacency, and an implicit reliance on the security of his previous reputation, so that we have less compunction in speaking of its author with the utmost possible freedom, and in designating his lucubrations on the mesmeric phenomena as the arrantest trash and nonsense. Is it, indeed, possible that this gentleman can be so prepossessed with the extent of his own reputation, as to imagine that, by the mere weight of his single name, he shall succeed in converting the whole world? If so, he must assuredly have borrowed the argument from the Baron du Potet Lennevoy, who never ceases, in all his papers, to iterate the names of great men who have believed in his doctrines, and to expatiate on the presumption of those who venture to differ, although he might have learnt from the same example the inefficiency of such a course of argument. From the Baron, too, he seems to have borrowed most of his other arguments; although here, again, we are bound to say, the Frenchman's are by far the best, and propounded, too, with the greatest air of plausibility.

Mr. Mayo presents, to our minds, the extraordinary spectacle of a man who has gone through all the phases of belief, until, at length, nothing is too extravagant for his exorbitant credulity. In his own emphatic language, "wonder succeeds wonder;" his appetite for the marvellous is not a whit palled by the extraordinary phenomena of somnambulacy, *prescience*, *clair-voyance*, or the transposition of the senses, by which a man may read the newspaper from the point of his great toe with as much clearness as by his right visual organs; but he is still insatiate after fresh wonders. In his last communication to the *Medical Gazette*, we are favoured with an account of the mesmerizability of substances, among which the precious metals are alone deserving of our confidence. "Silver and platina are less mesmerizable than gold; and copper, tin, zinc, and pewter, are not mesmerizable at all." So that no difficulty is now presented to the transmission of this invaluable philosophical toy to all parts of the world, except, indeed, that which arises from the scarcity of the precious metals, or the possibility of their charge transpiring, or exploding in the course of their passage. Fortunately, too, nothing can be easier than the art of mesmerization; for, "if you look for a minute fixedly upon one spot of a mesme-

whom have exercised the magnetic power; leaving the reader to determine, whether or no these extraordinary physical and

rizable surface, as, for instance, a stone mantle-piece, and a sovereign is then placed by the patient herself on the spot which you have looked at (the sovereign having been ascertained the instant before not to be mesmerized;—if the sovereign be allowed to remain a minute on the spot which you have so looked at, then, on the somnambulist taking up the piece of money, mesmeric effects will follow: thus, by looking upon a mesmerizable body, you may so mesmerize it, that another mesmerizable substance laid upon it shall, from it, be mesmerized sufficiently to produce decided mesmeric effects upon patients susceptible of this peculiar agency.”

Now, as to the question of the reality of these and similar facts, we have no hesitation in admitting that a great number of very curious phenomena may be produced by a combination of *pawing*, with certain exterior circumstances calculated to affect the imagination, especially of females of weak and susceptible minds. What we assert is, that every thing credible in these relations is matter of common experience from natural causes, and that every thing incredible is the result of deception. We might adduce, from the records of medicine, as well as from our own private experience, a long bead-roll of cases of the most marvellous character, but all of them in the persons of hysterical girls, whose flights and fancies have even baffled all attempts at description. Sydenham has truly told us, that there is no disease to which the human body is liable which hysterics will not sometimes simulate; in addition to which, it occasionally gives rise to other phenomena, which have no prototype in the ordinary course of disease. What wonder, then, that the paraphernalia of mesmerism should occasionally elicit these unlooked-for effects, or that these effects should greatly astonish those who have no experience of disease. Although, therefore, we admit the *possibility* of many of these things, we do not admit their *frequency*. In the majority of cases, we have no doubt whatever that they are founded in fraud, and in all cases where pretensions are made to *clair-voyance*, *prescience*, or the transposition of the senses, that the parties have been most arrant impostors. We deny that, in any case, aught has ever occurred more extraordinary than the gabble of the Irvingites, or the roar of the ranters, or the thousand other things which have occurred in history, from the combined effects of superstition, fraud, and disease. That the matter, however, may not rest on our bare assertion, let us examine a little into these experiments, performed on the 21st of June last, upon which Mr. Mayo's statements are founded.

These experiments were, in a great measure, conducted by Mr. Blake, who is a gentleman officially attached to the North London Hospital, and has published some account of the proceedings. Different substances upon this occasion, and among others water, were mesmerized. The parties operated on were the two Miss O'Keys, who have since, it is said, been dismissed the hospital, and openly confessed their tricks. The parties attending were Mr. Mayo, Mr. Wood, Dr. Elliotson, and a number of other persons. The experiments chiefly consisted, first, in immersing the fingers for a few seconds in mesmerized water; second, in placing mesmerized water within the lips, by means of small pieces of stick previously dipped; and, third, in drinking it. These experiments lasted two hours, and the effect produced was usually a state of magnetic sleep. Mr. Blake admits that Dr. Elliotson succeeded more frequently than he failed; but still that he did fail on some occasions. “It was not,” he says, “on one occasion only that *unmagnetized* water produced so unfortunate a result as stupefaction; but I am confident that at least six times, and I believe much oftener, was she sent to sleep by this means.” Then, again, as to the successful experiments, Mr. Blake justly remarks, either that the intended experiments were talked of openly in the presence of the patient, or else that there was an anxiety to obtain results when a magnetized object was employed, which was not evinced when the same substance, in its natural state, was used, an anxiety which never failed to indicate to these artful girls (“never forgetful of the part to be acted, even for a moment,”) the effects which were expected. “There is not the slightest hint or sign (Mr. Blake says) which will not be immediately seized by these girls, whose whole

moral phenomena are the result of a natural agent, or of a spiritual one, and whether that spirit be good or evil.

time, I feel convinced, is occupied in considering how they can keep up a deception, which, while it lasts, renders them objects of so much interest and attention, and which furnishes them with an asylum in our hospital, where they are on the best of terms with the greater number of those who frequent it." That this is the correct view of the matter, is confirmed beyond all question by the fact, that both in these as well as some other experiments which were made on the 29th, those made with magnetized water "almost constantly failed," and those with unmagnetized water almost constantly succeeded, when either a wrong hint was purposely given, or a deceitful anxiety evinced. In addition, however, to such exposures of carelessness and fraud, we think something must also be allowed to the opinions of sensible men, who, after witnessing these exhibitions, have almost uniformly come away totally unconvinced. In fact, a good deal of shrewdness is often necessary to detect imposture, as well as a good deal of practical experience, to be able to say when any event is contrary to the ordinary phenomena of disease.

Supposing, however, that many curious effects are sometimes produced, in what manner are we to account for them? And this brings us to our second proposition, which is that all the credible phenomena attributed to this agency, may reasonably be accounted for on common principles, and nothing is more unphilosophical than to seek for two causes. But if any of these phenomena are not to be so accounted for, we should look for the solution—not to mesmerism, for which we think there is no evidence, but to the principles developed in the text. Besides, how can the will of the operator produce effects of which he has no idea, much less experience, until the effects themselves are exhibited? If animal magnetism were really an existing principle, it should be constantly operative, and its effects also should be constantly uniform; whereas its influence is only exerted upon a few weak and hysterical girls, and its phenomena have varied with every new professor. It would be difficult to discover the remotest trace of resemblance in the effects produced by Mesmer himself, and those which are now wrought by his more modern disciples. And these we consider to be sufficient reasons for the rejection of the doctrine. Let us, however, hear Mr. Mayo in his philosophical mood. He says,—

"I think that the phenomena of prevision and transposition of the senses (and those of *clair-voyance* likewise, if the latter are true, and there is any thing in them beyond the workings of an over-active imagination), naturally lead to the supposition that they result from the workings of a spiritual nature, in a certain independence of those bodily organs to which it is normally closely tied and bound. It is conceivable that, in such cases as I have described, when all the common avenues of sensation are excluded,—when eyesight, touch, taste, hearing, are suspended,—and when a sort of vision is sensibly exercised by some part of the common surface of the body,—that these phenomena arise from the mind being in part dislocated and displaced from her corporeal tenement, holding on with misplaced attributes, to unaccustomed points and corners of the frame. It is conceivable again, that in that rapt and mysterious state, in which the individual is giving utterance to remote anticipations that are strangely verified, the mind is acting independently of its usual organs, and with the character of spirituality, is freed from the restraints of time, as in *clair-voyance* (if that state ever exist), it would appear to be partially free from the restraints of space. Man, we are told, was made in the image of God: These may be partial revealings of the parity of the spiritual nature of the created being to that of his Creator."

The learned writer enforces this *argument* by giving credit to the existence of second-sight, prophetic intimations, and a host of popular superstitions, which, he thinks, may "find their solution and explanation" in this philosophy. For our parts we think differently, and believe we have said enough to bring our readers to the same conviction. Our exceeding wonder only is, how two gentlemen like Mr. Mayo and Dr. Elliotson, professors of a practical art, officers of large public hospitals, and decorated with the insignia of the Royal Society, should so far have diminished their just fame, as to become the leaders of so despicable a party. We feel humiliated in the consideration, and in proportion as we respected their names before, have now felt it our duty to expose their ignorance, in order to prevent the contagion of their example.

The word somnambulism (which was generally substituted for that of animal magnetism when its adepts found themselves dispossessed of their famous fluid) was imported from France. New things require new names; and it is much easier to make a more extensive application of an existing term, than to discover an appropriate new one. Thus, what we now commonly understand by somnambulism, bearing some general resemblance in its external signs to that exceptional state, in which certain functions of the mind are exercised whilst the body is under the influence of sleep, one common word has been applied to three things essentially different, and which it becomes necessary to distinguish from each other.

The first is the ordinary affection of somno-vigil, for which the word was evidently formed, as it is generally accompanied by sleep-walking. The various complicated acts performed by persons in that state, are of a nature well calculated to puzzle those physiologists who attempt to explain all the exceptional phenomena of our complicated nature, in the which the material and the immaterial exercise a constant action and reaction on each other, subject to a series of laws which are wholly unknown. Examples of somno-vigil have no doubt fallen under the observation of most of our readers; in which the common functions of the organ of vision have been discharged, whilst the eyes are closed. Several authors who have specially occupied themselves with those matters, report instances of this sort, in which persons have selected different articles of dress from amongst others, with which they had been purposely mingled. A case much more astonishing, is that of a young man who was in the habit of rising during the night, whilst in this state, to continue the literary labours of the day, correcting the faults of orthography, and even substituting one phrase for another. The facility with which persons in this state avoid all obstacles, the eyes being closed, would justify a supposition, that the sense of sight is, as it were, absorbed into the sense of touch, and that even the sense of touch becomes so exquisitely acute, that it is affected without the ordinary condition of contact with its object. We beg leave, however, to decline furnishing a theory of perception for the state of somno-vigil, leaving that for the physiologists, who have an undisputed right to the first attempt; our object in saying so much was merely to submit to the reader the possibility of arriving at a satisfactory physical solution. As, by the process of analysis (physiologically speaking), all the five senses are reducible to the sense of touch (all sensation requiring the contact of the object with the organ, either directly, or by its medium), it is *possible* that the progress of science may, some day, enable us

to account for those things upon physical principles. We are by no means disposed to look beyond natural causes, when they are sufficient to account for the phenomena which come under our observation; we merely beg to admonish a certain class of our readers, in the words of Hamlet,

“There are more things in heaven and earth, Horatio,
Than are dream'd of in your philosophy.”

We consider this protestation as a necessary preliminary to the following remarks. Besides the state of somno-vigil, upon which we have just cast a hasty glance, there are two other forms of somnambulism essentially differing from each other in this circumstance, that one is *voluntary*, and the other *involuntary*. We mention the latter merely as a connecting link to complete our classification. These cases of *natural somnambulism* are by no means uncommon in the hospitals of large cities. The curious reader will find, in works treating specially of these matters, a detail of the various exceptional phenomena which they exhibit, all of which, however, are met with in a much higher degree of developement, in the last and capital form of somnambulism, which we propose to examine more at length. The most ordinary, is the exercise of the sense of vision without the intervention of the proper organ, generally by the application of the object to the back of the neck or to the abdomen of the patient. It is sometimes effected without contact, and notwithstanding the intervention of an opaque body. We had a case under our own immediate notice, in which a female, who had been for some time in a state of nervous debility, was observed, in playing at cards, to look at them much less than is ordinary upon such occasions; and upon the experiment being tried, it was found that she played equally well when the physician held a book before her eyes. In other cases, the patient has described the state of the internal organs which were diseased, and prescribed an efficacious remedy. As, in these cases, it is impossible to establish the existence of a *preliminary prevarication*, we shall express no opinion as to the nature of their origin. We merely observe, that all effects which do not result from the ordinary powers of nature, according to the fixed laws of the physical universe, must be attributed to a modification of those laws by spiritual agency, good or bad.

As to the third form of somnambulism, which is called *Animal Magnetism*, we shall use less reserve. And we shall speak the more freely, because, in the present day, many persons are found tampering with these things, out of a feeling of idle and dangerous curiosity, without having duly reflected upon the conse-

quences. There is implanted in the human bosom a certain yearning after the marvellous, which always finds its object, legitimate or illegitimate. In all ages, and in all countries, this powerful feeling has not only served to give a deeper interest to the poet's tale, but has left profound traces of its existence in the superstitious practices even of the most civilized nations. Those who are not completely absorbed in the busy struggle of active life, soon feel the insufficiency of *visible objects* to satisfy those vast desires which mark the origin and future destiny of our race. The present order of things, where at each instant we find the trace of an universal perturbation which has defaced its primitive beauty, cannot long suffice for beings who have an intuitive perception of the absolute; and much less when their self-evident inanity is confirmed by divine revelation, which not only signals the fact, but even condescends to explain it. What importance can any reasonable being, who believes himself to be immortal, attach to objects which are ever fluctuating, that organization which serves as the medium of communication being subject to the same laws?

The insufficiency of *visible objects* under the actual law of their being, is perhaps the first motive which induces men of restless minds, to cast a dangerous look towards agents of a superior order. The middle ages are full of examples of this fatal curiosity, and without attaching implicit belief to all the instances which have been handed down to us, contemporary writers, and even the judicial records of those times, have preserved a series of facts, which it would require an extraordinary dose of credulity to reject. We say of credulity, because to reject an historical fact, reposing upon the testimony of grave, prudent, and impartial men, who were eye-witnesses to it, supposes the power of believing that all those persons were either deceivers or deceived, a thing generally less probable than the one disputed. But the reason of the facility of credence in one case, and the difficulty in the other, is explained, when we reflect that, upon the admission or negation of a certain order of facts, reposes a grand fundamental principle, the establishment or the subversion of which settles the endless dispute between *matter* and *spirit*.

It is not, then, to be wondered at, that, in the present state of things, that inordinate curiosity, the germ of which existed in a state of innocence, should prompt us to tamper with things the nature of which is unknown. This is already a grave error, and appears replete with danger, and the more so, when we reflect that we are surrounded by beings of a nature superior to our own, who renew continually the insidious proposal of the arch-deceiver, to open to us the arcana of forbidden knowledge.

Several persons who have written upon the subject of animal magnetism, have, without hesitation, ascribed it to demoniacal agency. It is, in fact, a circumstance which cannot escape the attention of a careful observer, that many of the external signs attendant upon animal magnetism, are the same as those exhibited in cases of sorcery and demoniacal possession, and in the ancient pagan world, by the sybils and prophetesses, whilst under the influence of the spirit of vaticination. This coincidence has not escaped the notice of persons who have written upon the subject. Monsieur Deleuze, of the Jardin des Plantes at Paris, a man of high reputation in the scientific world, who has particularly occupied himself with this matter, writes as follows:—

“The most celebrated writers of antiquity have handed down to us a vast number of phenomena analogous to those which animal magnetism usually presents. Its wonderful effects were familiar to all the nations of the ancient world. They were generally attributed to some supernatural influence, or to incantations, talismans, and other chimerical operations, possessing in themselves no specific efficacy.”*

The same author, on another occasion, mentions a circumstance to which the reader will attach that degree of importance which he thinks proper.

“The period at which animal magnetism made its appearance, in its present form, coincides with that of the disappearance of sorcery and witchcraft.”†

We shall now proceed to examine the means employed, and the effects produced. The first preliminary condition (and which, according to M. Deleuze, is a condition *sine quâ non* in the subject) is, the consent of the will. A sort of perfect submission, at least implicit, of the patient to the operator.‡ If he opposes any resistance to the operation, it is without effect. But this relates only to the initiatory proceeding. Once subjected to the power of the operator, all resistance is vain. The second condition, which relates to the operator, is a formal intention to produce the effect, and a certain power, which it appears all do not possess, and which, even amongst the initiated, exists in various degrees. But even when these two conditions concur, the effect is by no means certain. The ceremonial appears not only arbitrary, but even superfluous. Mesmer used a sort of bath; others proceed by certain complicated manipulations of the body, which the French operators call *des passes*; others employ merely a continuous irritant regard. This is, in fact, the *hocuspocus* of

* Histoire Critique du Magnétisme Animal, part ii. sect. 4, ch. 11. See also L'Hermès, Journal du Magnétisme Animal, t. ii. p. 49.

† L'Hermès, No. d'Octobre 1828.

‡ Hermès, No. 32.

the affair, and is left wholly to the taste of the magnetiser ; its *effects* are a much more serious matter.

When the operator succeeds, the patient falls into a state of insensibility, which is improperly called sleep, but which much more resembles lipothomy or paralysis. The reader will find a minute detail of its various effects, in the works of the above-named professor, and in those of Monsieur D'Henin. The Drs. Petelin, Georget, Filassier, Roslau and Bertrand, with many others, have written works on animal magnetism, and have published the result of their personal observations. The latter, in a work entitled *Du Magnétisme Animal en France*, reports a case, which cannot fail to strike the reader, by its analogy to similar cases frequently met with in judicial inquiries of witchcraft and sorcery.

“ At least one half of the somnambulists who have fallen under my personal observation, *were completely deprived of all sense of feeling.* I have seen a practitioner of the magnetic art, who was operating in the presence of a numerous company, engage each person present to take a pin and force it into the body of the somnambulist. The patient was singing, and during the successive insertion of from forty to fifty pins, which were left sticking in different parts of the body, not the slightest change of voice was perceptible.—pp. 391, 411.

According to other experiments, the senses of hearing and sight appear to be equally inert ; persons allowing their eye-lashes to be burned off without winking, and remaining insensible to the report of a pistol fired off close to the ear. Yet, at the same time, these very persons answer the slightest whisper of the operator, and describe, with the minutest exactitude, the surrounding objects, even to the contents of people's pockets. What is not a little remarkable is, that the cause (whatever it may be) having ceased to act, these persons retain not the slightest remembrance of what has passed. There were several of the patients who had not been witnesses of its effects upon others, who considered the whole affair as a hoax, and refused to believe a word of it.*

These things are indeed astonishing, but there remain others behind yet more so. A young lady of Arcis sur l'Aube, who had accompanied her father to Paris, whilst in a state of somnambulism, saw her mother, who had remained at Arcis sur l'Aube, busied in her ordinary occupations, all of which she described with the minutest exactitude. The letters of the mother, which were always written before any communication could possibly have arrived from Paris, confirmed the correctness

* L'Hermès, t. i. p. 163.

of her vision. Her father, Monsieur Chapelain, and the Dr. Filassier, used every means to investigate this curious case, and to prevent the possibility of deception.* The same young lady, whilst in the state of somnambulic lucidity, *saw* and described events which happened only several days afterwards. She described the visits which her mother would receive at Arcis sur l'Aube on a certain day, and related the conversation which would take place. She announced the letters which her mother would receive, and described their contents, and the effect they would produce upon her. All these facts are related in the work above referred to, the author of which, Dr. Filassier, thus speaks of his own conversion to a belief in the wonders of animal magnetism.

“ Many extraordinary circumstances, relating to magnetic somnambulism, had been related to me by persons for whom I entertained the highest respect; but notwithstanding the imposing authority of their testimony, I acknowledge that I never could bring myself to believe them. My faith in animal magnetism is the result of various observations, and of repeated experiments; it is therefore tenacious as the *facts* upon which it reposes. All those which have fallen under my personal notice, I have examined with the most rigorous scrutiny, and I may add, with a certain degree of obstinate suspicion; and I have only adopted them, after a complete demonstration of the impossibility of their being the result of the imagination, of collusion, or of fortuitous coincidence. My numerous experiments have enabled me to establish beyond a doubt, the lucidity of persons under the influence of magnetic somnambulism, independently of the ordinary conditions of time and of space.”

It would be easy to multiply examples similar to those which we have above given; but as this matter is merely incidental to the subject before us, we beg leave to refer the curious reader to the sources which we have already indicated. We cannot, however, refrain from adding a second case of *prevision*, the details of which strike the mind with horror.

M. Georget, in his early experiments at the Salpêtrière, magnetised a woman, who, whilst in the state of somnambulism, told the operator that she saw the day of her death. She passed in review the events of each day which was to intervene. The Sunday she was to go out of the hospital to dine with her relations. She added, that, towards evening, she would be taken so unwell, that it would be necessary to convey her home in a coach; that her indisposition, in the first instance but slight, would become daily more serious. She enumerated all its symptoms and accidents; how the fever would be succeeded by delirium, and how an important organ, being seized with paralysis, would cause

* Quelques Faits et Considérations pour servir à l'Histoire du Magnétisme, p. 11.

her death at a certain hour on a certain day. The operator, horror-struck, as he himself avows, awoke the patient out of her magnetic sleep. She retained no remembrance of her fatal prediction, which was nevertheless accomplished in its minutest details. This highly curious fact was published in the third volume of the *Hermès*.

All effects must have a cause, and that cause must be either *natural* or *supernatural*. In the present case, reduced to this dilemma, we are forced to avow that these things appear to us wholly beyond the power of any natural agent. Admitting (for the sake of argument) the existence of a nervous or magnetic fluid, emitted by the operator, and capable of producing certain effects upon the nervous and muscular system of the patient, it is preposterous to suppose that such an agent should enable the magnetized person to foretel future events, or even to see things passing in distant places. The only reasonable hypothesis, in the present state of our knowledge, is the intervention of evil spirits, whose object is to lead men astray as to the nature of those miracles and celestial visions which are occasionally permitted for certain particular providential ends. This solution seems borne out, not only by certain avowals of the adepts of animal magnetism, but more particularly by the direct assertions of those who have submitted themselves to its influence. M. Deleuze advises the practitioner to abstain from all attempts to investigate the nature of the agent; but he admits *that its action differs from that of all known bodies, and cannot be explained by any of the properties of matter*.* After having thus rejected all natural causes, he allows himself, in a future publication, to be drawn into an avowal of the reasons for which he had thought proper to conceal his suspicions as to the real cause. A letter having been addressed to M. Deleuze tending to prove that a great number of persons, whilst in the state of magnetic somnambulism, had asserted that they held intercourse with the invisible world, he admits the fact, and adds,—

“ I think it necessary to assign the reason why I have passed over these circumstances which seem to prove the intervention of *spirits* [he makes use of the word *des intelligences*]. It is, that such a belief, taking possession of the imagination, is calculated to trouble the reason, and lead to consequences highly dangerous.”†

M. Deleuze having been educated according to the principles of the eighteenth century, has a becoming dread of all spiritual agency; but we have said enough to convince any im-

* L'Hermès, vol. ii. p. 176.

† The letter and the answer are both to be found in La Bibliothèque du Magnétisme, for the year 1818.

partial enquirer, that these things can never have been effected by ordinary means. We might easily have multiplied our examples, and even have chosen others still more appalling in their circumstances, but we consider those selected as quite sufficient. We have only to add, that these portentous scenes are daily repeated in London and in Paris, and in all the principal cities of Europe.

As it is beyond doubt that the invisible world, like the visible, is the scene of conflict between the good and the evil principle, is it to be supposed that the former would, under existing circumstances, remain completely passive? Such a conclusion would be contrary to all just principles, and equally contrary to fact. Miraculous and supernatural phenomena are by no means uncommon in the present day, but the sceptical spirit of the age refuses to examine their just claims of credibility. The Church yearly adds to the list of canonized saints, and in *every case* she bases her judgment of the sanctity of the subject upon *duly authenticated miracles*. Other cases, which are left to the tribunal of private judgment, abound; but it is the fashion to say little about them, for fear of wounding certain morbid sensibilities; or lest the narrator should be exposed to the derision of those who treat such things as foolish inventions, or at least as the misconceptions of an over-credulous mind.

Amongst the most remarkable cases of this nature which have offered themselves in our day, is that of Sister Emmerich, an Augustine nun, of whose numerous visions a portion was lately laid before the Christian world, by the care of a gentleman of undoubted probity, of great learning, and of eminent piety, under the *implicit* sanction of high ecclesiastical authority. Its *explicit* sanction is seldom given to works of this character, each individual being left to judge them according to their intrinsic merits, and according to the rules laid down by theologians in these matters. It is true that, in certain cases, the supreme authority orders an investigation, but only when some particular circumstances have rendered such a step necessary; for such writings can in no case become a rule of faith or of morals. They are merely tolerated as books of edification, as Benedict XIV fully explains. "The approbation of private revelations implies nothing more than this, that, after a careful examination, they are allowed to be published for the edification of the people." That this prudent reserve of the Church may not be misconstrued, he adds,—“Although they are not entitled to the same belief as the truths of religion, we believe them with a faith merely human, according to the rules of ordinary prudence, as they are more or less

probable.”* Supposing, therefore, the subject of such presumed visions or private revelations to be deceived as to their supernatural character, their intrinsic merit remains the same. If, as in the present case, they relate to the life and sufferings of our Divine Redeemer, the pious reader may, if he chooses, use them as ordinary meditations on that moving subject, without embarrassing himself as to their ordinary or supernatural origin. Such, however, will never be the position taken up by the man who duly esteems the privilege of being a living member of that society which was divinely instituted and is miraculously maintained. Feeling the relation in which the Church stands with regard to her divine founder, namely, as the beloved bride of a royal spouse, he will be prepared for the special favours by which He, from time to time, charms the tedium of her exile; and he will accept with gratitude these signal marks of His constant love. He will call to mind the special favours conferred on the blessed Hildegarde, on Saint Catherine of Sienna, and on Saint Bridget, whose revelations were approved by the general council of Basil.

That the reader may form a correct idea of the prudence with which the investigation of these matters was conducted, we shall proceed to indicate, in a summary manner, the five tests applied by the Cardinal Turrecremata, who was charged by the council of Basil to examine the case of St. Bridget, and we shall hereafter take occasion to point out their action on the case before us. The first point examined was, whether the person who was the subject of the revelations, acted with the knowledge and under the direction of her superiors, and of other persons versed in spiritual matters. The second related to the effect they produced on the person herself; that is to say, whether they increased her humility, her piety, and her obedience. The third regarded the matter of the revelations, as to its holiness and tendency to edification. The fourth, their accordance with the Holy Scriptures, and with the Catholic faith. The last was applied to the moral conduct of the person. To those who require a greater degree of precaution, we have nothing to reply; but before we proceed to lay before the reader the details of the case before us, we beg leave to reply, by way of anticipation, to two objections which are commonly made to books of this sort. The first is, that they are full of extravagancies; the second, that they frequently contradict their predecessors who have written upon the same matters, and not unfrequently contradict themselves. We shall say nothing to a third objection, of their being occasionally unintelligible, as we consider that the nature of the subject, and

* De Canoniz. Sanct. l. ii. c. 32.

the limited resources of human language, render that inconvenience inevitable. As to the charge of extravagance, we have merely to reply, that those who make it would do well to remember, that our Blessed Saviour and his apostles were frequently charged with extravagance, and even regarded as men who were out of their wits; and that, upon a memorable occasion of the outpouring of the Spirit of the Most High, its effects were attributed to an excess of wine. As to the second objection, the existence of occasional discrepancies, we beg to remark, that such things are not uncommon in the depositions of the most veracious witnesses, and may very naturally be attributed to an infirmity of the memory. They should rather be regarded as a mark of the probity of the author, as it would have been an easy task to suppress them. We should do well also to bear in mind the perturbation which must necessarily result from such supernatural visitations; and also to reflect that, in visions, the mode of perception is altogether exceptional, having to do with symbols which have no direct relation to things as they exist in the visible world.

The visions of Sister Emmerich have been laid before the public both in Germany and in France in an anonymous form. This circumstance might have thrown upon them a certain shade of discredit, had not its real motive been well known. Clement Brentano, by whose pious care these rich treasures have been preserved, is a man who enjoys, in his own country, and throughout Germany, a high reputation both as a poet and as a scholar. Having undertaken this work as an act of religious duty, he refused to associate his name with that of the highly-favoured subject of these visions, considering himself, in this circumstance, merely as her secretary. The reader will see with what pious constancy he remained with her in poverty and in sickness, from the moment of his first interview, until the hour of her death, a period of several years. Nothing can account for such an act of self-immolation, but the sentiment of an important duty; in fact, this gentleman had been appointed by her confessor, with the consent of the bishop (a most saintly man), to take down in writing the admirable things which she related whilst in the state of extasy, and those which she still preserved in her memory, upon the recovery of her ordinary faculties. The present translation is the work of a person not less esteemed in France, who has chosen to follow the example of his predecessor, in withholding his name, from motives equally honourable. It is the production of one of the professors of the *Catholic University* established at Louvain, one of the most magnificent institutions of modern times, the expenses of which are wholly defrayed by the voluntary contributions of the Catholics of Belgium.

The meditations upon the dolorous passion of our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ, are preceded by an introduction of the most unpretending modesty. The compiler, probably in consideration of the age in which he lives, offers them to the public as a work having a character purely human, and hence the modest title of *Meditations*. Such, however, is by no means the general opinion, and we think that the unprejudiced reader, when he becomes fully acquainted with them, and when he considers the extraordinary circumstances which attended them, will, without hesitation, ascribe them to a supernatural power. We cannot, however, refrain from admiring the cautious reserve, and the pious discretion, which dictated it. As it is extremely short, we shall lay it before the reader, in order that he may judge for himself.

“ The following *Meditations* are perhaps destined to occupy an honourable place amongst works of a similar nature, which are the fruits of a contemplative love of Jesus; but we here expressly declare that they put forth no claim to historical exactitude. They follow humbly in the train of those descriptions of the passion of our Blessed Saviour, which have so often occupied ascetic writers. At most, ought they to be regarded as the meditations of a devout religious during the holy season of Lent, related without art, and from her personal dictation. She herself attached to them an authority purely human, and she dictated them only from a sentiment of obedience, at the reiterated order of her spiritual directors, men of approved piety and known discretion. The writer of these lines was introduced to her by the Count Leopold de Stolberg, a name well known in the Catholic world; Dean Overberg, her confessor, together with the pious Sailer, then Bishop of Ratisbon, who had often been her guide and her consolation, prevailed upon her to relate what she had experienced. The latter, who survived her, took a lively interest in the publication of the following pages, the result of her personal communications, being dictated by her own mouth. These illustrious dead, of pious memory, lived in a continual communion of prayer with Anne Catherine, whom they loved and respected on account of the signal graces which had been vouchsafed to her. The compiler of this book met with the same encouragement and sympathy on the part of the last Bishop of Ratisbon.* This eminent ecclesiastic, so deeply versed in spiritual matters, both by study and by experience, who understood so well the mysteries of grace, as it relates to certain favoured souls which are, as it were, hidden in Jesus Christ, took the most lively interest in all that related to Anne Catherine. Having been informed of the existence of the present work, he strongly recommended its publication. He frequently repeated, these things have not been confided to you in vain; Almighty God has some special end in view; its publication cannot fail to profit many souls. He added to these exhortations instances of different

* Witmann, the worthy successor of Sailer, a man of eminent holiness, whose memory is venerated by all the Catholics of the south of Germany.

works of this nature, the utility of which he had recognized for himself and for others. He used to call these privileged souls the marrow of the mystical body of Christ's Church, according to the expression of St. John Chrysostome, *medulla enim hujus mundi sunt homines sancti*, and he neglected no means to promote the publication of their lives and writings.

"Introduced by a kind friend into the chamber of the holy bishop in his last moments, the author* was surprised at being recognized by him, as he appeared for a considerable time to have nearly lost the power of speech; he, however, saluted him most amicably, and engaged him affectionately to persevere in his undertaking, for the glory of Almighty God; adding, at the same time, his episcopal benediction. Encouraged by these respectable authorities, we have, at the entreaty of many of our pious friends, consented to make public these meditations on the passion of our Blessed Saviour, by a poor nun, to whom God gave the grace to be at one time, simple and unpretending as a child, at another, penetrating and sublime; animated with the most heroic zeal, but ever forgetful of herself, being fortified in Jesus Christ, and established in humility, and the most admirable and entire abnegation."—p. xvii.

It is impossible to use language more moderate, and at the same time, more impressive. He attributes to these *Meditations an authority purely human*, and, in fact, they have no other. We beg leave, however, to press upon the attention of the reader, that this circumstance influences in no degree the question of their *supernatural origin*; for we have already seen that the writings of St. Bridget, approved by the highest authority, pretend to no more. The question of the real origin, in this case, is no question of idle curiosity, but one of vital importance; for the pious reader will take up a book of this sort with feelings of a very peculiar nature, when convinced that its contents are the result of a special interference of divine mercy. The solemn recommendation of the bishop of the diocese in which these things happened, in his dying moments, is a circumstance by no means to be overlooked.

We shall now proceed to detail some of the most remarkable events in the life of the subject of these *visions*, which furnished the matter of the above-named *Meditations*; and in so doing, the question of their origin will, we imagine, be completely set at rest.

Anne Catherine Emmerich was the daughter of poor but pious parents, belonging to the class of agricultural labourers. She was born on the 8th September, 1774, at a village in the bishoprick of Munster, situated about half a league from Coesfeld. Her childhood presents many points of resemblance with that of

* Le rédacteur de ce livre.

the venerable Anne Garcias, and with that of Sister Domenica del Paradiso. Her guardian angel frequently appeared to her in the human form, and at an early age, the principal circumstances of Scripture history were rendered familiar to her in a series of visions. In a word, that veil which, for the generality of men, intercepts the wonders of the *invisible world*, was, in her case, continually drawn aside, and she lived in constant intercourse with its spiritual inhabitants. The author (in the biographical sketch which follows the introduction) enters into the most astonishing details on this subject, and mentions a circumstance of touching naiveté, relating to that period of her life. At first she spoke freely of these spiritual favours, not being aware of their supernatural character. Supposing that all the children of her acquaintance experienced the same things, and remarking their silence with regard to them, she considered herself less discreet than her companions, and resolved in future to imitate their modest reserve. As she grew up, she was occupied in the rude labours which belong to persons of her condition in that part of Germany, to which she added a series of the most severe mortifications. She devoted to sleep but the time strictly necessary, and the same principle was applied to her food. She passed a considerable portion of every night in prayer; in the winter, frequently kneeling upon the frozen snow, exposed to all the inclemency of the season. Her bed consisted of a few boards disposed upon the ground in the form of a cross. With regard to her food, she contented herself with what the rest of the family rejected, and even from this scanty fare she selected the best portions for the sick and the necessitous. She constantly subdued her curiosity as to all visible objects, which had no immediate relation to the grand affair of her sanctification, saying, that these trifling sacrifices were repaid an hundred-fold by the renewal of the spiritual life. She compared the effects of these mortifications, to that of the pruning-knife when judiciously applied. She had ever a remarkable intuition of such mystical analogies. The object of her existence, the means of attaining that object, the sufferings and the dangers which awaited her, being manifested to her in a series of symbolic visions, amongst which the culture of the vine, and the labours of the vineyard, frequently recurred.

The author himself passes over many interesting circumstances of her early life, and our limits do not even permit us to relate those which he has preserved. There is one, however, so peculiar, and of such high interest, that he has thought proper to give it in her own words. It relates to a special miraculous favour, which forms one of the most prominent features of her life.

“ In the year 1798, four years before my entry into the religious life, I was in the church of the Jesuits at Coesfeld, about the hour of noon. Whilst kneeling before a crucifix, as I was plunged in a profound meditation, I felt myself penetrated, as it were, with a sort of genial warmth, and I beheld descending from the altar (in the tabernacle of which reposed the holy sacrament) my celestial bridegroom, under the form of a youth of resplendent beauty. In his left hand he held a garland of flowers, and in his right the crown of thorns, of which he offered me the choice. Having selected the latter, he placed it on my head; upon my seizing it with both my hands, to fix it more firmly, he disappeared, and a sensation of acute pain brought me to myself. I was at this time obliged to quit the church, as they were about to close the doors. A friend, who was kneeling beside me at the time, might, I thought, have observed something peculiar in my situation. On arriving at home, I requested her to examine my forehead, speaking to her in general terms of my *dream*,* and the violent pain which accompanied it. She found no exterior mark, but was in no way astonished at what I related, as she was aware that I frequently experienced certain extraordinary things, the cause of which she did not understand. The next day, my forehead and temples were very much swollen, and I suffered great pain. The swelling and the pain returned frequently, and lasted sometimes for several days and several nights. I only remarked the presence of blood, upon my companions observing to me, that my cap was full of red spots. I gave no explanation of the cause; but in future I arranged my head-dress in such a manner as to conceal the blood which flowed from the wounds. I took the same precaution upon my entry into the convent, where only one person discovered my secret, and that person never divulged it.”—p. xxiv.

Many other persons have borne in their body the marks of the passion of our Lord. The cases of St. Francis of Assisium, and that of St. Catherine of Sienna, are familiar to our readers, and repose upon evidence of the most unequivocal character. The case of Sister Emmerich, who, at a subsequent period, received the marks of the sacred stigmata, reposes upon evidence not less satisfactory, having been investigated, not only by the competent *civil* and *ecclesiastical* authorities, but also by several of the most eminent scientific men of the day, of every shade of opinion, all of whom unanimously agreed, *That no physical hypothesis could account for a wound remaining open for a number of years, without the necessary accompanying symptoms of inflammation and suppuration, and without the formation of a cicatrix.* We beg leave to refer such of our readers as may be desirous of entering more at length into the details of this investigation, to the letter of the eminent German physician, Druffel,

* Sister Emmerich, out of a feeling of modesty and pious reserve, attributes to this extraordinary vision the character of a *dream*, although it is evident, from the context, that, at the moment, she was not *asleep*.

published in the *Salzbourg Medical Journal*, in 1814. The Count de Stolberg had already, the preceding year, published a letter (which was reprinted in the principal literary journals of the day), giving a minute account of the state in which he had found her at that period.

In 1802, in the 28th year of her age, notwithstanding her extreme poverty, she succeeded in getting admitted into the Augustine Convent at Dulmen. Nothing can be more interesting than the account of her noviciate, during which, those extatic phenomena which appeared to be an ordinary mode of her existence, were renewed in various forms. Her extraordinary state rendered her an object of dislike to the other religious, and the conversations which they held respecting her, were audible, for the despised novice, in the remotest corner of the convent. If the rules of the order were infringed, she had a sort of spiritual intuition of what was passing, and frequently, moved by an interior impetus, she appeared suddenly on the scene of those irregularities, and recited that passage of the conventual rule which related to the circumstance, without ever having committed it to memory. She pronounced her vows on the 13th November, 1803, but her trials did not end there. She says, however, in speaking of this period of her life,—

“ I lived in peace with Almighty God, and with all his creatures. When I was occupied in the garden, the birds came and reposed upon my head, and upon my shoulders, and we sung together the praises of the Most High.”

In the lives of many holy persons we find similar examples of the interruption of that state of permanent enmity which exists between man and the brute creation, particularly in the lives of St. Francis of Assisium and of St. Anthony of Padua.

She relates, moreover, that, whilst she had the care of the chapel, she was frequently borne through the air, to the most elevated parts of the building, in a manner altogether supernatural, being apparently sustained by innumerable spirits, who aided her in the duty of establishing a proper order, and external decency, in the temple of the Most High.

In 1811, the convent was suppressed, during the short reign of Jerome Bonaparte, and the poor sick nun, driven from the long-desired solitude of the cloister, found a miserable asylum in the house of a poor widow, who offered her a small room on the ground-floor, the windows of which looked into the street. No situation could have been less favourable for the exercise of a contemplative life; yet here, as in a future lodging, which was in a common public house, exposed to the riotous interruptions of a drunken peasantry, her extasies and her commerce with the

invisible world augmented. It was on the 29th of December, in this year, that she received the sacred stigmata. The means by which this circumstance, and others relating to her sufferings, became known, are altogether providential; for out of a feeling of humility, she never mentioned them. They were all related by her whilst in the extatic state, and as regarding some person unknown. These things, like the holy instrument they represent, are, we regret to say it, a scandal and a stumbling-block to many. We are, however, at a loss to imagine what ground is assumed by those Catholics who affect to turn their backs upon such facts, seeing that the supreme authority, so lately as the year 1831, added to the list of canonized saints a person who bore in her virgin body the sacred stigmata; and many other instances are to be found in the authentic annals of the Church. The author makes the following remarks on this subject.

“ We find many examples in the Catholic Church, since the days of St. Francis of Assisium, of persons who have attained to that degree of contemplative charity, known to theologians by the name of the *Vulnus divinum*, or *plaga amoris viva*. They amount at least to fifty. Veronica Giuliana, of the order of St. Francis, who died at Citta Cantello, in 1727, is the last of the number who was canonized (26th May, 1831). Her life, published at Cologne in 1810, gives an account of persons in that state, and establishes a considerable analogy between her case and that of Sister Emmerich. Amongst the most remarkable in our day, are the cases of two nuns of the order of St. Dominick, Colomba Schanolt, who died at Bamberg in 1787, and Magdalena Lorger, who died at Hadamar in 1816. We may also add those of Rosa Serra, a Capuciness of Ozieri, in Sardinia, who received the sacred stigmata in 1801. Josephina Kumi, of the Convent of Weser, near the lake of Walenstadt in Switzerland, and who still lived in 1815, belonged to this class of persons, but we are not certain whether or no she was marked with the sacred stigmata.”—p. xxxv.

At this period of her life, her extatic state appears to have been almost permanent; the conditions of time and space were annihilated, and she was admitted to an ineffable intuition of the secret essence of things, their origin and their signification. A circumstance not a little remarkable is, that in her relations with the *invisible world*, she followed the order of the ecclesiastical calendar. The festivals of the Church were for her something more than the pious commemoration of some past event; she considered the origin of each as a solemn act of divine mercy in the present order of things (in *time* and *space*), the special end of which was, the rehabilitation of the human race. Although these divine acts appeared to her in their *essence*, independently of time and space, she was aware that, in order to profit by them, man, in his present condition, must, as it were, take possession of

them, by an act of the will, *successively*; and that to that effect they were repeated yearly by the Church, according to a certain established order. She likened them to the fruits of the earth, which succeed each other according to the various seasons; and she was indefatigable in gathering those precious fruits of grace, and in preserving them, and offering them up for such as neglected them. We would willingly have dwelt more at length upon this new and important view of the nature and end of the ecclesiastical year, which is based upon a profound philosophical principle; as our limits prevent us, we must content ourselves with referring our readers to the work itself. We shall confine our extracts to the following short but admirable passage.

“The spiritual and animal life of Sister Emmerich were in a continual sympathetic union with the Church, as manifested in time. It was a relation more imperious than that which submits our ordinary existence to the influences of the seasons, of day and night, of the sun and moon, and the variations of climate and temperature; by which she bore witness to all the mysteries and solemnities celebrated by the Church militant. She followed them with such fidelity, that, at matins, her interior and her exterior condition underwent a marked change. When the spiritual sun of the mystical day had set, she turned towards the dawn of that which succeeded, in order to sanctify all her prayers, her labours, and her sufferings, by the special graces attached to it, as a flower refreshed by the night dews turns its bright petals to the first rays of the rising sun.”—p. 199.*

“A total revolution took place not only at the sound of the *angelus*, which was liable to be advanced or retarded by the ignorance or neglect of those whose duty it was to announce it, but also when the real moment arrived, which marked the division of time, corresponding to the eternal order of things, and in a manner altogether independent of the ordinary laws of perception.

“If the Church celebrated a dolorous festival, she was overwhelmed with grief; but the moment a festival of triumph was announced, both her soul and body seemed to be invigorated with some new special grace, and she remained till the ensuing evening, calm and full of serious joy, as if a veil had been drawn over all her sufferings. *All this was accomplished in a manner wholly independent of her will.* As she had desired, from her earliest childhood, to be sincerely obedient to Jesus Christ, and to the Church, she had received, at the hands of Almighty God, a special grace, which had modified her nature in such a manner, that she turned spontaneously towards the Church, as a flower turns to the light.”—p. 200.

As we are unwilling to destroy the touching pathos of that scene which describes her last hours, we shall merely say that she died, as she had lived, an example of the most fervent piety,

* See also p. 354, and in the Biographical Introduction, pp. xl. xlviii. and lviii.

and of the most admirable submission to the divine will. The persons who rendered to her mortal remains the last sad offices of mercy, thus describe them :—

“ Her feet were placed one on the other like the feet of a crucifix ; the marks of the sacred stigmata were rather more red than usual, and upon raising up her head, the blood flowed from her nose and from her mouth. All her joints remained flexible to the moment of her interment.”

It appears that, on the evening of her funeral, a considerable sum of money was offered, on behalf of a Dutch physician, in order to obtain permission to disinter the body. The proposal was of course rejected ; but this circumstance gave rise to a report, that the body had been stolen ; and to calm the popular effervescence, an official inspection of the tomb took place ; the following particulars of which are extracted from a literary Catholic journal published at Koerz.*

“ About six or seven weeks after the death of Anne Catherine Emmerich, a report having been circulated that her body was stolen, the coffin was secretly opened, by orders from the superior authority, in the presence of seven witnesses. They saw, with a feeling of surprise, mingled with admiration, that the body remained unchanged. The features preserved a smile, similar to that of a person under the influence of an agreeable dream. She was, in a word, precisely in the same state as at the moment of her interment. If it be a duty, as observes the son of Sirach, *to keep the king's secrets*, is it not equally a duty to proclaim to the world the admirable wonders of the Divine mercy ?”

From what has been said, the reader will no doubt already have come to the conclusion that the *visions* of Sister Emmerich (for it would be affectation to persist in calling them *Meditations*) had a Divine origin. Her obedience to her spiritual superiors, particularly as regards this matter, her increasing humility, and the angelic purity of her life, preclude the possibility of supposing the intervention of demoniacal agency, and it is equally impossible to account for these things by natural causes. The subject-matter itself is beyond the reach of objection, being perfectly in accord with the Holy Scriptures and with Catholic tradition, completing thus the five distinctive marks adopted as tests, and of which we have spoken more at large in a former part of this article.

As members of a Church, by the prayers and consecrations of which the order of nature is interrupted at every instant (if not *visibly*, at least *really*), we should blush were we, in our judgment of this matter, to give way before the superficial and sceptical spirit of the age in which we live. It is high time for

Catholic men to take up a position worthy of the name they bear. We sincerely believe that there is nothing to be gained in allowing our Protestant and philosophical friends to batter down our outworks, out of a mistaken notion of *liberality*, and lest we should interrupt that kindly feeling which is a necessary element in the common intercourse of social life. That these things are unfit matters of conversation in mixed companies, no one can deny; but when the subject is introduced, the Catholic who slinks away, and hides himself behind the pretext that they are *non-essentials*, not being *matters of faith*, shews but a faint zeal for our holy mother the Church. Men may hold opinions diametrically opposed to those of our friends, and may even justify those opinions, without losing sight of that mild and unassuming charity, which is the very foundation of the Christian life. Our feeling towards such of our Christian brethren as possess the truth in a form less complete than ourselves, can never be any other than one of the most tender commiseration; and we should ever be on our guard not to allow human passions to mix themselves up in a discussion, the sole end of which is the glory of Almighty God, and the welfare of our fellow-creatures. But this praiseworthy mansuetude must not be allowed to degenerate into indifference, as to the matters at issue. Nothing is indifferent in the general economy of Divine providence, even in the order of nature, much less in the order of grace. The showers of early and of latter rain, so abundantly poured forth upon the earth, have each a special object, and in like manner, the showers of Divine grace; and in both cases, its accomplishment depends, frequently, upon the zeal and vigilance of man. Before the fertilizing action of the summer shower, comes the sowing of the seed; and before the seed is confided to the bosom of the earth, a long and laborious preparation is generally necessary. Sister Emmerich, in her symbolic visions, constantly saw the Church, and the individual soul, under the form of a mystical garden or vineyard. She speaks in the most eloquent manner on the subject of spiritual culture; and particularly points out the fatal error of those who content themselves with clearing the surface, without taking the trouble to extirpate those venomous roots which render the ground unfertile.

As to the work itself, it is not our intention to lay before the reader any considerable extracts. The subject is one more fitting the retirement of the cabinet, than the pages of a journal of periodical literature. What we have just said of spiritual culture, is particularly applicable to the dolorous passion of our Blessed Saviour; it ought never to be considered in its details, without a special preparation. Let us remember that his very disciples

were scandalized at these things. Those who are disposed to receive this book as a special mark of Divine favour to the age in which we live, would do well to reserve it for the holy season of Lent; thus entering into the spirit of the Church, they will be made partakers of those special graces which are accorded to her prayers and penitential works. If any one should take it up out of a feeling of idle curiosity, or to charm the ennui of a vacant hour, he will certainly be disappointed. It becometh not a Christian to look immodestly upon those wounds and those cruel mockings, which are the doleful fruits of his own individual sins. Where is the man who never buffeted or spat upon the meek son of Mary? Woe, woe be to us, if we gaze upon his crown of thorns, and upon the agonies of his bloody sweat, as upon an idle pageantry of grief.

We shall, therefore, and by way of conclusion, confine ourselves to the following extract, taken from the first meditation, the subject of which is the agony of our Blessed Saviour in the garden of Gethsemani. Our readers will remember, that, according to Scripture history, our Lord, having approached the three disciples who accompanied him, found them sleeping. The following extract corresponds in point of time with the sacred text, where the evangelist informs us, *that leaving them, he went again and prayed the third time.*

“ When Jesus had returned into the cavern, and all his sorrows with him, he prostrated himself with his face to the earth, his arms extended, and prayed to his Heavenly Father. This new struggle lasted nearly an hour. The holy angels manifested to him, in a series of visions, all the sufferings which he must undergo, for the expiation of sin. They shewed him man's pristine beauty, as created in the image of God; and how the fall had changed and disfigured it. He beheld the origin of sin in man's first offence, the signification and the essence of concupiscence, and its terrible effects upon the powers of the human soul; and also the essence and the signification of its corresponding penalties. They laid open to him all the pains and humiliations he was about to endure, in satisfaction of the Divine justice; sufferings of body and of mind, comprising all the penalties incurred by the universal concupiscence and accumulated offences of the human race. The human debt was to be paid by the human and sinless nature of the Son of God. The holy angels manifested these things under divers forms, and I was admitted to the perception of their discourse, yet without hearing any voice. No language can express the fear and sorrows which overwhelmed the soul of Jesus, at the sight of these terrible expiations; the horror of this vision was such, that his body was bathed with a sweat of blood.

“ Whilst the humanity of Christ was weighed down by this awful weight of suffering, the angels were moved with compassion; there was a slight pause. It appeared to me as if they desired most ardently to console him, and that they prayed before the throne of the Almighty to that end. There was, as it were, a momentary conflict, between the justice

and the mercy of God, and the love which offered itself in holocaust. An image of the Deity was manifested to me, not as at other times, seated upon a throne, but in a luminous form. I beheld the divine nature of the Son in the person of the Father, and, as it were, reposing in his bosom; the person of the Holy Ghost proceeded from the Father and from the Son. He was, as it were, the connecting link between them, yet the three persons formed but one God. No language can render these things completely intelligible. What I experienced was rather an interior intuition, than a vision of distinct forms. It appeared to me as if the divine will of Christ retired into the Father, in order that his humanity alone might support all those sufferings, which his human will prayed the Father to turn from him. I beheld this at the moment that the angels were moved with compassion, and when they desired to be permitted to console him; in fact, he received at that instant a momentary relief. After this, all disappeared, and the angels abandoned him to renewed suffering.

“ When the Redeemer, on the Mount of Olives, chose to experience, and to vanquish, that violent repugnance which our nature feels for pain and for death, and which extends itself to every species of suffering, it was permitted that the tempter should act in his behalf, as in the case of every one who sacrifices himself to a holy cause. In his first agony, Satan laid before him the enormity of the debt of sin, which he undertook to satisfy; and he carried his audacity so far, as to look for certain imperfections in the works of the Redeemer himself. In his second agony, Jesus beheld, in its full extent, the bitter expiatory suffering required for the satisfaction of Divine justice. This was represented to him by angels, for it does not belong to Satan, to manifest that which may be expiated. The father of lies, and of dark despair, manifests not those works which relate to Divine mercy. Jesus having triumphed in all these rude combats, by abandoning himself to the will of his Heavenly Father, a new circle of fearful visions opened before him. That feeling of doubt and perturbation which, in the human soul, always precedes the consummation of a sacrifice, took possession of the soul of the Redeemer as he proposed to himself the awful question—To what end this sacrifice for so many who will refuse to profit by it? Here the most terrible picture of future times, filled with sorrow that heart which was melting with love.

“ Before the soul of Jesus passed in terrible array all the future sufferings of the apostles, and those of his disciples and friends. He beheld the primitive Church, few in number; and as that number increased, he saw the cruel irruptions of heresy and schism, renewing man's first crime of pride and disobedience. He beheld the lukewarmness, the corruption, and the malice, of an infinite number of its members; the lies and deceptions of its pharasaical doctors; the sacrileges of its unworthy priests; and the fatal result of all those acts, the abomination of desolation in the sanctuary of the Most High, and in the bosom of that ungrateful race which he was about to redeem with his most precious blood, and by his inexpressible sufferings.

“ I beheld the crimes of every age, down to the present day, and even till the end of time. Every form of error and imposture, of furious

fanaticism, of obstinacy, and of malice; all the impostors and heretics, and the pretended reformers, disguised in the false garb of sanctity. Both the corruptors and their victims outraged and tormented the suffering Redeemer; some, as not having been properly crucified, in their eyes; others, as not having suffered, according to the mode which they approved; and all, with furious zeal, tore in fragments the seamless vesture of his holy Church. Some maltreated him, insulted him, and denied him; others passed by with contempt, wagging their heads, and avoiding his outstretched arms, hurried towards the abyss, in which they were swallowed up. He saw a multitude of other persons, who, not daring openly to deny him, turned with disgust from the wounds of his mystical body, the Church, as the Levite of old from the traveller who had fallen into the hands of robbers. They fled from his wounded spouse, like base and dastardly children, who abandon their mother at night-fall, at the moment when the robber and the murderer arrives, having first set open the door by their negligence and by their crimes. He beheld all these persons, at one time, under the form of those who are separated from the true vineyard, and repose amidst the wild grapes; at another, as flocks dispersed abroad, abandoned to the wolf; led by hirelings into sterile pastures, and refusing to enter into the fold of the Good Shepherd, who gave his life for his sheep. They wandered without a home amongst the burning sands of the desert, and refused to direct their eyes towards that city, which is built upon a hill, and which cannot remain concealed; the dwelling of his affianced bride, his Church, which is founded upon a rock, and with whom he has promised to remain until the end of time. They built for themselves miserable hovels in the sand, which they continually destroyed, but they had neither altar nor sacrifice. Their doctrines changed with the wind, and they were constantly in contradiction with each other. Sometimes, in a moment of rage, they destroyed these miserable buildings, and hurled their fragments against the immoveable corner-stone of the Church. Others there were who, although darkness reigned in their dwellings, came not to the light which is placed upon a candlestick in the house of the bride, but wandered with their eyes closed round the gardens of the Church, living upon the perfume which they exhale; they held out their arms towards nebulous idols, and followed wandering stars, which led to wells having no water. They refused to listen to the voice of the bride who calls; and dying with hunger, they treated with arrogant disdain the messengers who invited them to the nuptial feast. They entered not the garden, for they feared the hedge of thorns. Intoxicated with vanity, they possessed neither wheat for their hunger, nor wine for their thirst; and, blinded by their own false light, they proclaimed invisible the Church of the Word made flesh. Jesus beheld them all, and he wept over them. He willingly undertook to suffer for all those who refuse to acknowledge him, and to bear their cross with him, in the city built upon a hill, in that Church which is founded upon a rock, to whom he gave himself in the holy sacrament, and against which the gates of hell shall never prevail."—pp. 65-69.

- ART. VII.—1. *Speeches of Henry Lord Brougham upon questions relating to Public Rights, Duties and Interests, with Historical Introductions, and a Critical Dissertation upon the Eloquence of the Ancients.* Edinburgh. 1838.
2. *Opinions of Lord Brougham on Politics, Theology, Law, Science, Education, Literature, &c. with a Memoir of his Lordship's Life.* London. 1838.
3. *Speech of the Right Hon. Lord Lyndhurst, delivered in the House of Lords on Thursday, August 18th, 1836; being a Summary of the Session.* 21st Edition. London. 1836.
4. *Speeches of the Bishop of Exeter, on Thursday, March 1st, 1838, in the House of Lords, on presenting a Petition from the City of Cork, 2nd Edition; and on 26th July, 1838, on the Church Discipline Bill.* London. 1838.
5. *Speech of the Bishop of Norwich, delivered in the House of Lords May 25th, 1838, on the National System of Education in Ireland.* London. 1838.
6. *Hansard's Parliamentary Debates.* Vols. XV. to XL. New Series. London. 1833-38.
7. *The Mirror of Parliament.* Edited by John Henry Barrow, Esq. Vols. XVIII. to XXXVI. London. 1833-38.

AS poetry is the first, so oratory is among the last of the arts acquired by a polished nation. In Greece and in Rome, all the other arts had arrived at considerable perfection before oratory can be said to have existed; and, afterwards, its progress in each nation towards perfection was extremely slow. Still it made continual advances, improving with the increased knowledge of the people's leaders, till it attained its highest perfection in the one nation in the person of Demosthenes, and in the other in the orations of Cicero.

Hazlitt, indeed, says, that "to be a great orator does not require the highest faculties of the human mind; but it requires the highest exertion of the common faculties of our nature. An orator has no occasion to dive into the depths of science, or to soar aloft on angel's wings. He keeps upon the surface,—he stands firm upon the ground; but his form is majestic, and his eye sees far and near: he moves among his fellows,—but he moves among them as a giant among common men. He has no need to read the heavens, to unfold the system of the universe, or create new worlds for the delighted fancy to dwell in; it is enough that he sees things as they are; that he knows, and feels, and remembers the common circumstances and daily transactions that are passing in the world around him." And although he need be neither a philosopher nor a poet, yet it is necessary, before

an orator can exist, that his audience should have made some advances in general knowledge, and that he himself should be well versed in those parts of literature which feed the springs of eloquence; that he should thoroughly understand the structure of the human mind; that he should be a complete master of history, to enable him, on many occasions, to appeal to the venerable evidence of the dead; that he should know how to dilate and expand his subject, by reducing it from the limited considerations of time and person, to some general and indefinite topic; that he should be able to enliven his address with an agreeable digression, to rouse the indignation of his audience, and to extort from them the tear of compassion; and, finally, that he should have the power of influencing and bending the soul of his hearers in such a manner as shall best suit his purpose.

An orator cannot create, he can only imitate or echo back the public sentiment; it is necessary for him, therefore, to address an informed audience; and thus, although eloquence may and does exist, yet oratory never can find a place, except in an advanced state of a nation's progress. Moreover, the sciences must be generally cultivated, and there must be afforded to the orator both ease and leisure; for oratory "is the attendant of peace, the companion of ease and prosperity, and the tender offspring of a free and well-established constitution."

All the advantages for a cultivation of the art have of late years existed in England, and yet nothing seems to have made such small advances as pure oratory in the British Senate. Debates have increased to an almost interminable length,—column after column in the daily newspapers records the sayings in the great assemblies for English eloquence:—almost every member in the Lower House, and full many in the Upper, feel themselves called upon, by an imperative sense of public duty, to essay their comments upon public men and public measures; and yet, after all the expenditure of time and trouble, how little remains that is worth the remembrance beyond the passing hour!

In some respects, indeed, Parliamentary oratory has degenerated. Not to go back to the traditionary excellence of a St. John or a Chatham, but confining our observation to the days within the recollection of many members of the present generation, and to the time since the accurate reports of the daily proceedings of the legislature enable us, from the recorded specimens, to form our own opinion, how great a falling-off has there been!

There is no longer in either House a Burke, with lively and impassioned images, with profound knowledge, and in a tone as philosophical as captivating, to enchain the attention, and to in-

culcate, in the most flowing periods, and the most measured but alluring sentences, the favourite doctrines of the statesman; the nervous energy of a Fox; the ever-ready, ever-biting retort of a Pitt; the keen wit, the pointed satire, the brilliant imagination, the overpowering eloquence of a Canning, are yet wanting; and there exists not one legislator, who, with an almost inexhaustible flow of words the best chosen, and of flowers of rhetoric the most carefully culled,—who, with a quickness of fancy, and with an acute sense of the ridiculous, can alike amuse and convince a reluctant audience;—in a word, who can supply the place of a Sheridan?

Part of this retrogression may, perhaps, be attributed to a cause which, although somewhat startling, is nevertheless true, that oratory is inconsistent with a very high degree of civilization, and, for the same reason, that the drama, however great may be the excellence of the writings or the actors, cannot again flourish in England to anything like its former extent. When the great mass of the people think for themselves, and when even the middle classes are very far advanced in general knowledge and acquirements, they have naturally a dislike to every thing which depends for its effect upon delusion. They have, after full deliberation, formed their own settled opinions,—they have no dislike to a discussion of their soundness,—but they have a great aversion to being, as it were, cheated out of them. But like the stage, the whole end and aim of oratory is to substitute the fictitious for the real, and by means of the physical senses, to lead captive the intelligence of the auditory; in fact, to divest the hearer unwarily of his own opinions, and to substitute in their stead those of the accomplished speaker. To enable an orator to effect his object, his hearer must readily credit what is said,—he must imagine every thing to be true, and believe and relish the force of it,—and, in fact, the persuasive language of the speaker must win his absolute, his hearty assent. Now this is incompatible with a very advanced state of civilization and general knowledge. A well-informed hearer does not surrender himself up to be worked upon through his physical senses by the person who is addressing him. “The general merit of an orator,” says Cicero, “must and will be decided by the effects which his eloquence produces. For there are three things which an orator should be able to effect, namely, to inform his hearers, to please them, and to move their passions.” The two first of these requisites may with difficulty, the last can scarcely be accomplished in a highly civilized nation. Hence possibly it is, why, independently of the state of English society, which, by its conventionality and absence of warmth, is generally unfavourable

to the display of that "passion which makes men eloquent," we may consider oratory in this country to have passed its meridian.

The present deficiency may, however, be partially ascribed to another cause, "that vice of much speaking, which is the fashion of the present day." Every man representing a popular constituency is expected to say something. On the hustings in his own town the admired of all admirers, possibly the most wealthy, frequently the most personally beloved man in his neighbourhood, holding political sentiments in accordance with the majority of those whom he addresses, every successful candidate is a Triton among minnows. The favourable audience to which he has been in the habit of addressing himself, charmed with his ready command of words, remember not the old and trite, but, at the same time, perfectly just remark, that it is not every ready, or even every eloquent speaker, who is an orator; they applaud him to the very echo; he fancies that he has succeeded; he takes but little farther pains; he, upon almost every occasion, pours out in his place in Parliament his empty verbiage, or his common-place observations; he is delighted at seeing himself at due length in the reports of the following morning; a few mere clap-traps or well-pointed personal remarks have procured from his party some hearty cheers, and for these loquacious babblings, this accomplished person and applauded speaker is proclaimed to the world as an orator. But of oratory in its pure sense,—of that lucid arrangement of facts,—of that convincing method of selecting details,—of that ready flow of the best chosen words, placed in the most appropriate situations,—of that keenness of perception, which detects the weakest points in an adversary's statement, and either puts old arguments in a new light, or discovers yet an unexhausted fund,—of that fertile imagination, which can at the same time win the attention, move the passions, and enlist the sympathy of the hearer,—but above all, of the extensive, the copious, the nervous, the majestic orator, there exist at the present day but few examples.

Among the hereditary legislators, a refinement of sentiment and of diction, a vast fund of information, drawn from classical and modern authorities, an easy style, and an unexceptionable method of delivery, take the place of the declamation and the mere debating subterfuges which obtain in the Commons; there is a charm, therefore, in the more polished every-day speaking in the Upper House, which is in vain sought for among the usual debaters in the representative assembly. And although some thirty years ago it was said to be "morally impossible that the House of Lords should ever be able to rival the House of Commons in the display of splendid talents, because all questions of

importance are first debated in the Commons; and even if the members of the Upper House had anything of their own to say, the words are fairly taken out of their mouths;" yet the change of circumstances of late years, and the nicely balanced state of parties since the passing of the Reform Act, have called forth the latent energies of the peers, and their debates have not only rivalled, but surpassed in general beauty those of the other House. Still, there is in the Lords as in the Commons, a general absence of those higher qualities to which alone the name of oratory can be legitimately applied.

There are, however, in both Houses among the legislators, since the Reform Act, to which period we must, to prevent diffuseness, limit our remarks, some splendid exceptions to the general rule which unfortunately at present exists; there are in each some few men to whom the title of orator would, in any age, and under any combination of circumstances, be willingly accorded. To this class belong, in the Lords, Lord Brougham, Lord Lyndhurst, Earl Grey, the Bishop of Exeter, and the Marquis of Lansdowne; and in the Commons, Mr. O'Connell, Sir William Follett, Lord Stanley, Mr. Shiel, Mr. D. W. Harvey, and Lord Palmerston. These, though, with one or two exceptions, inferior to the great men to whom we have referred, possess, in a greater or less degree, the essentials of true orators.

Following the example of those of olden time, and to preserve for future times authentic specimens of those speeches which have produced the greatest effect both at the bar and in the senate, Lord Brougham has sanctioned the publication at the head of our list;* and although a book must lose much of that spirit which makes a speech delivered in public appear to greater advantage than when it is perused in the closet; yet enough remains within these volumes to justify most amply the station which, as an orator, public opinion has awarded to his Lordship.

It is not our intention to follow Lord Brougham through the critical examination of ancient oratory which is added to the more material portion of his work; neither can we find space to quote

"The glowing portraits, fresh from life, that bring
Home to our hearts the truth from which they spring,"

and which are scattered with profusion through his pages. Suffice it to say, that they present an accurate description of many

* We notice the second work entitled "*Opinions*," &c. only for the purpose of stating, that we believe it to have been compiled without any assistance from Lord Brougham; and by the subsequent authorized publication of his speeches, revised by himself, his Lordship has shown that he did not take part in or sanction the issue of the "*Opinions*."

of his contemporaries. Every sketch evinces the greatest power of discriminating character, but the estimate which he has formed of Bentham is superior to all others, and is as just to the memory of the great moral philosopher, as it is true and perfect as an inquiry into his powers. In the following pages we shall confine ourselves to a short examination of the various excellencies of the Parliamentary orators whose names we have before given, and who, since the passing of the Reform Bill, have taken part in the discussions of either House.

It is singular, however, that, with these exceptions, the persons composing the Ministry, and the leaders of the Opposition of the present day, can put forward no legitimate claim to the character, to which every legislator most anxiously aspires; for although most of them are neat and clear in stating the nature of the subject, yet not one is warm and forcible in moving the passions of his audience.

Applying ourselves, in the first instance, to the hereditary branch of the legislature, let us proceed to the task before us.

In the DUKE OF WELLINGTON we find a man who can deliver, in the most straight-forward manner, the few observations which he occasionally addresses to the House. No man has a better choice of plain words, and no man can convey in clearer language those sentiments which he wishes to impress upon the House or the Country; but of oratory he is no master; even to eloquence he can advance no claim:—

“ He has been bred i' the wars
Since he could draw a sword, and is ill school'd
In boulded language: meal and bran together
He throws without distinction.”

But the vigour of some of his sentences, the happy and often cutting turn of others, added to the willing homage paid to him for his military achievements, and even for his general political conduct whilst at the head of public affairs in this country, and the singleness of purpose and sincerity of manner which characterize his addresses, give a charm to all he says: and the deficiencies of his elocution are overlooked in the plain good sense of the speaker, and the excellencies of the man.

Neither is the premier an orator. An accomplished scholar, possessed of a nice discrimination in the selection of the terms he employs, with an unpretending but earnest delivery, and taking on all occasions a comprehensive and philosophical view of the subject in debate, LORD MELBOURNE is sure of attention, whenever he rises to propound a motion or to reply to attacks, neither few in number, nor wanting in severity, which are almost

nightly made on his government. Indeed, when warmed by the harshness of some of the remarks which have been made, he sometimes rises with the occasion, and administers, in an almost overpowering manner, as severe a castigation as can proceed from any member of either House. Thus, after Lord Brougham's attack on the Canada Bill, on the 2nd February, Lord Melbourne eloquently and forcibly replied to the taunts, and parried the biting attacks which had been made upon him :—

“ For the part of the noble and learned Lord's speech recommending harmony and conciliation, and attention to the dictates of justice tempered with mercy, the only pure and enlarged policy, I am extremely obliged. Those parts of the noble and learned Lord's speech which were of a different nature, which were so severe and sarcastic in their tone, your Lordships will readily excuse me from troubling you with any lengthened reply to. My Lords, I have long expected the outburst—I all along knew that it must come—that the spirit of bitterness, the acerbity of feeling which took its birth in the noble and learned Lord's mind in the beginning of 1833, and which has been gathering strength and bitterness from long and forcible suppression, must break out at last. This is nothing more than I have long expected—than is natural ; for most people are blind in respect to themselves, and it is impossible to conceive in their own case that which is clear and manifest to all the rest of the world, and which is approved and assented to by the general opinion of all who have considered the subject. I thank the noble and learned Lord for his active support in 1835 ; I thank him for his absence from the House in 1836 ; I thank him for his less active support in 1837 ; and I feel no irritation at the very different tone which the noble and learned Lord's regard for the public service, his great patriotism, and his anxious desire for the people's well-being, has reluctantly compelled the noble and learned Lord to adopt in the present session.”

Except, however, on these occasions, Lord Melbourne, in his addresses, exhibits little of pure oratory.

Far above all his compeers (save one) ; at the very head of modern European oratory, and, considered as a Parliamentary advocate, never perhaps surpassed ; approached only by a successful rival, who, by a strange fatuity, was alike his predecessor and his successor in the highest legal office ; having risen from his temporary retirement with powers undiminished—with strength increased like a giant's by repose—with energies unexhausted—with industry and activity in no way lessened ; released from the trammels of office ; once more the ardent and the eloquent advocate of humanity and of freedom,—stands HENRY LORD BROUGHAM. In every speech he displays the proper and distinguishing talents of an orator of the first class ; such as digressing from his subject, to embellish and diversify it,—soothing or alarming the passions,—exhibiting every circumstance in

the strongest light,—imploping the compassion of his audience,—and artfully enlarging on those topics and general principles of prudence and morality on which his stress of argument depends. Possessed, therefore, of all the requisites for an accomplished orator, night after night before an adverse audience he propounds in language the most chaste, in arrangement of ideas the most lucid, and in argument the most logical, those doctrines and those views which, scarce ten years since, in another assembly, carried all before him, and as the representative of the largest of the English constituencies, placed Henry Brougham in the front of the assertors of liberty. Well did M. Dupin describe him, when, in a recent sitting of the Academy of Moral and Political Sciences, he said, “He has sought in the profoundest sentiments of enlightened philanthropy the most powerful sources of his eloquence.” Whenever we hear or read any of his speeches we recognise at once “*Oratio gravis, erudita, liberalis, admirabilis, polita, conspersa, quasi verborum sententiarumque floribus.*” In his address to the Glasgow students, he praised above all the oratory of Demosthenes, but his own style differs altogether from that of the great Athenian orator; neither does it follow, like the speeches of Grenville and Tierney, the school of Cicero. Lord Brougham’s addresses are especially deficient in the perspicuity which marks every oration of Cicero; and although they abound in evidence of an attentive study of the severest models of Roman oratory, yet they are not servile imitations, but show that, like a great master, Lord Brougham has formed a style peculiarly his own. Time after time we fancy that we recognize in the speech which is delighting us, almost a paraphrase of the choicest of Cicero’s orations; but were we to search those orations from end to end, we should, with few exceptions, find little in substance or in language like to the applauded speech of Lord Brougham. He belongs, however, to the same class of orators as Tully,—to that class of “lofty and majestic speakers, who distinguish themselves by the energy of their sentiments and the dignity of their expressions. He is impetuous, diversified, copious and weighty, and abundantly qualified to alarm and sway the passions.” And yet, when the nature of the subject or the occasion requires it, he can vary his style, and be simple in his language, and moderate in his manner, though dexterous and keen in his argument. In the accumulation of matter in a sentence, in the involution within involution, all rendered clear to the dullest perception of the dullest hearer by the modulations of tone and other accomplishments of true eloquence, Lord Brougham is unrivalled. Often after a sentence occupying six or seven minutes in the delivery, when our doubt is greatest how

the speaker will, as it were, recover himself, and bring a conclusion applicable to the opening,—whilst all is lost in wonder and amazement at the ingenious web that has been spun, we find him, without effort and without difficulty, drawing back with a happy turn to the main point of the argument, and in a few short words most eloquently ending his, to others, most complicated sentence. He exhibits, also, a wonderful combination of sentences; but his language, though rapid and voluble, is neither loose nor exuberant. No one at the present day can follow, even at a vast distance, his accumulation of epithets to designate any particular action or line of conduct, on which he may be commenting; epithet follows epithet, each apparently more apposite than its predecessor, and whilst we conceive that no farther selection of words can be used, another and another yet succeeds, till the accumulation appears overwhelming, and we almost execrate the perpetrator of the conduct which has been thus condemned. In these particulars, indeed, Lord Brougham's oratory stands unmatched by any living speaker, and it was only in the swelling eloquence of Robert Hall that we recollect it ever to have been equalled. Of sarcasm and of irony Lord Brougham is a ready master,—one only can answer, none can endure his efforts in either of these veins. "In one particular also," writes an able judge, "Lord Brougham is without an equal—in the felicity with which he clothes a great moral dictum or moral truth in a phrase so expressive, familiar, and portable, that it is taken up and circulated with electric rapidity among the people. This is one of the arts or means which place him above all rivalry in his age for popular or public effect." His never-to-be-forgotten phrase of "the schoolmaster is abroad," is a notable instance of this power. Nor is this all. He is fully successful "in the deep and full measure of impassioned declamation, in its legitimate combination with rapid argument," which he has rightly described to be the highest reach of oratory, and in which Canning failed. "Tum incitatus et vibrans, tunc accuratus et politus." Again and again has he displayed in his orations in both Houses of Parliament, especially the Lower House, that thunder of eloquence—

"Which shook the nations through his lips, and blazed
Till vanquished senates trembled as they praised."

Neither does he forget the deportment of the body, the turn of the eye, and the apt sound to every word that is uttered, which conspire to form the finished orator. Although it is certain that many of the happiest portions of his speeches must be carefully studied, yet he lacks none of the ready powers which constitute a mere debater, and little deficiency is discovered either in his

matter or in his manner, when his powers are called forth on an emergency,—such as that in the last sitting before the Easter recess, when, provoked by Lord Seaford's speech into an early discussion of the Apprenticeship Abolition Bill, he dealt with the arguments advanced, and denounced the slave owners' champion as eloquently, and perhaps more entertainingly, than he would have done after the most careful preparation. Occasionally, however, he elaborates too much his details, he somewhat over-colours the picture, and in his anxiety to place the subject before his hearers in every possible point of view, he is not unfrequently betrayed into apparent contradictions.

The Roman terseness of his style is well illustrated in the following opening to his speech on the maltreatment of the American colonies, delivered on 2nd February last, in opposition to the Canada Government Bill.

“ How comes it to pass, my Lords, and by what fate of mine is it,* that as often as this great question of our colonies comes on in this place—whether in the ill-fated Resolutions of last May, or in the interlocutory conversations raised by the expectations of this measure, or on the address which announced its nearer approach, or now on the Bill itself which embodies it—I alone should be found to interrupt the universal harmony of your councils—alone to oppose a Bill presented by the Government without any defence, but immediately taken up and zealously supported by their adversaries—alone to rise up in defence of the constitution—alone to resist the breach of all law, the violation of all justice, in this high court of law, which distributes justice without appeal—alone to withstand arbitrary and tyrannical innovations, standing here, in the Senate—the conservative Senate of a free country—alone to maintain the peace, and stay the dismemberment of the empire, among your Lordships, who, of all men that live, have the deepest interest in peace, and the empire being preserved entire? The position which I occupy is surrounded with difficulty and embarrassment; the task I perform is a thankless one; but I will not—I may not—abandon the post in which my duty has planted me; and I am here, at the last hour of the hateful conflict, again attempting to discharge this ungrateful duty. From so unequal a contest I may retire defeated, but not disgraced. I am aware that I may gain no advantage for those whose rights I am defending, but I am well assured that I shall retain the approval of my own mind.”

* In this exordium *ex abrupto*, Lord Brougham departs from his usual course, and uses nearly the exact words employed by Cicero in his second Philippic against Mark Antony, which thus commences, “ Quonam meo fato, patres conscripti, fieri dicam.” The style of some of the remainder of the above extract seems also to be drawn from the exordium to the oration Pro Sex. Roscio Amerino, which runs thus, “ Credo ego, vos iudices, mirari quid sit, cum tot summi oratores hominesque nobilissimi sedeant, ego potissimum surrexerim, is qui neque ætate, neque ingenio, neque auctoritate sim cum his qui sedeant comparandus; omnes enim hi, quos videtis adesse in hac causâ, injuriam novo scelere conflata putant oportere defendi: defendere ipsi propter iniquitatem temporum non audent.”

Withering, also, was the following condemnation of the conduct pursued by Sir Francis Head, and the boast made of it in his despatches :—

“ The crime charged upon the Canadians, and for which they are to be punished by the loss of their free constitution, is refusing supplies. Instantly the Resolutions are passed. The noble Earl (Aberdeen) confesses that those Resolutions are calculated to harass and vex the Canadians. Then their natural consequences follow : the Canadians are irritated, and no precaution whatever is taken to prevent them from revolting ; not a man is sent ; not an order issued ; not an instruction forwarded ; not one line written ; not one word spoken, to prevent what is freely admitted to be the natural consequences of the Resolutions ! All this seems sufficiently marvellous ; but this is not all : we now have a scene disclosed that baffles description and mocks belief—a scene which I defy the history of all civilized, all Christian countries, to match. A governor—appointed to administer the law—to exercise the authority of the state for the protection of the subject—one commissioned to distribute justice in mercy—whose office it is above that of all mankind to prevent crimes, and only to punish them when it exceeds his power to prevent them being committed—he who, before all, because above all, is bound to guard against offences the people committed to his care—he who first and foremost is planted by the sovereign in authority to keep the people out of doing any wrong, that the law may not be broken, and there may be no evil-doers to punish—he it is that we now see boasting in his despatches, wherein he chronicles his exploits,—boasting yet more largely in the speech he makes from the throne which his conduct is shaking, to the people whom he is misgoverning,—boasting that he refrained from checking the machinations he knew were going on ; that, aware of the preparations making for rebellion, he purposely suffered them to proceed ; that, informed the crime was hatching, he wilfully permitted it to be brought forth ; that, acquainted with the plans laying by traitors, with the disaffection hourly spreading, with the maturity every moment approached by treason, with the seductions practised upon the loyal subjects, with the approach each instant made by the plot towards its final completion, and its explosion in a wide-spread revolt ;—he, he the chief magistrate and guardian of the peace, and executor of the law, yet deemed it fitting that he should suffer all to go on uninterrupted, unmolested ; should turn a deaf ear to the demands of the peaceable and the loyal for protection, lest any such interference should stay the course of rebellion ; nay, sent away the troops for the express purpose of enticing the disaffected to pursue and to quicken the course of their crimes ! Gracious God ! Do I live in a civilized country ? Am I to be told that such is the conduct of a parent state towards her children of the colonies ? Is this the protection which we extend to the subjects over whom we undertake to rule on the other side of the Atlantic ? . . . The fact was known, but the plan is now avowed ; and the fatal result is before the world. Blood has been shed ; but not on one side only—the blood of the disaffected has indeed flowed ; but so also has the blood of those whom our

wicked policy had suffered traitors to seduce. It was not until that horrid catastrophe had happened, that the king's peace was allowed to be restored! I am filled with unutterable horror and dismay at this scene! I appeal to the bench of bishops! I call upon them that they lay this matter to their hearts, and reflect upon the duty and the office of a Christian man. Shall he be held guiltless, be his station what it may, if he allows sin in others whom he has the power to save from it, much more if he takes measures for ensnaring his brother into guilt, that he may fall, and pay the penalty of his transgression? How much more, then, if he be a ruler of the people, set over them to keep them right! I call upon the reverend judges of the land to frown down by their high authority, this monstrous iniquity! Let them tell how they deal with the men who come before their tribunals, not as vindicators of crime, and enforcers of the law—but as tempters to seduce the unwary, and make him their prey! Let them describe to us those feelings which fill their breasts, when the very scum of the earth's scum is cast up before the judgment-seat,—that indignation which agitates them, and seeks its vent upon the head of him who might have prevented the law from being broken, but prefers, for some sordid purpose, standing by to see the offence perpetrated, and then drag his victim to justice! That indignation they must now transfer to this place, and pour it upon the supreme ruler of a province, who has the courage to boast that such has been his conduct towards the people committed to his care; vaunting of such misdeeds to the sovereign who employed him, and to the subjects whom he misgoverned in the trust which he betrayed!!”

One of the best specimens of Lord Brougham's manly eloquence and of his persuasive yet firm appeals to the sympathies of his hearers, is to be found in the peroration to his speech on the slave trade, delivered on the 29th January last. It is, however, in the description in glowing terms of every-day scenes of peace, and joy, and happiness, among a well-governed people, that his Lordship exhibits peculiar excellence; and in the happiest vein did he, in his speech on the 20th February, for the immediate emancipation of the apprentices, put forward the good conduct of the negroes on the first day of their apprenticeship, as an argument to show that an immediate termination of the apprenticeship system was perfectly safe. Equally beautiful and pathetic in the extreme was his description of the unprotected state of the apprentices. His simple diction, his subdued tone during the narrative, his impassioned denunciation of the verdict, and the again modulated notes in which he delivered the philosophical remarks in the concluding sentences, must still live, and will endure through a long series of years, in the recollection of those who fortunately heard the delivery. Indeed, as was said of Demosthenes, “he who reads Brougham, only loses much the better part of the oration.”

“I have had my attention,” said he, “directed within the last two

hours to the new mass of papers laid on our table from the West Indies. The bulk I am averse to break; but a sample I have culled of its hateful contents. Eleven females were punished by severe flogging, and then put on the tread-wheel, where they were compelled to ply until exhausted nature could endure no more. When faint, and about to fall off, they were suspended by the arms, in a manner that has been described to me by a most respectable eye-witness of similar scenes, but not so suspended as that the mechanism could revolve clear of their persons; for the wheel at each turn bruised and galled their legs, till their sufferings had reached the pitch, when life can no longer even glimmer in the socket of the weary frame. In the course of a few days, these wretched beings languished, to use the language of our law—that law which is thus so constantly and systematically violated—and ‘languishing, died.’ Ask you if crimes like these, murderous in their legal nature, as well as frightful in their aspect, passed unnoticed—if inquiry was neglected to be made respecting these deaths in a prison? No such thing! The forms of justice were on this head peremptory, even in the West Indies—and those forms, the handmaids of justice, were present, though their sacred mistress was far away. The coroner duly attended—his jury were regularly impannelled—eleven inquisitions were made in order—and eleven verdicts returned. Murder! manslaughter! misdemeanour! misconduct! No—but ‘Died by the visitation of God!’—Died by the visitation of God! A lie!—a perjury!—a blasphemy! The visitation of God! Yes; for it is amongst the most awful of those visitations by which the inscrutable purposes of his will are mysteriously accomplished, that he sometimes arms the wicked with power to oppress the guiltless; and if there be any visitation more dreadful than another—any which more tries the faith and vexes the reason of erring mortals, it is when Heaven showers down upon the earth the plague—not of scorpions, or pestilence, or famine, or war—but of unjust judges and perjured jurors—wretches who pervert the law to wreak their personal vengeance or compass their sordid ends, forswearing themselves on the Gospels of God, to the end that injustice may prevail, and the innocent be destroyed!

‘Sed nos immensum Spatiis confecimus æquor
Et jam tempus equis fumantia solvere colla.’ ”

Having thus noticed the various beauties of this accomplished orator, we shall delay our readers only by extracting his elaborately prepared peroration to the same speech:—

“ I turn away from the horrid vision, that my eye may rest once more on the prospect of enduring empire and peace, founded upon freedom. I regard the freedom of the Negro as accomplished and sure. Why? Because it is his right—because he has shown himself fit for it—because a pretext or a shadow of a pretext can no longer be devised for withholding that right from its possessor. I know that all men at this day take a part in the question, and they will no longer bear to be imposed upon now they are well informed. My reliance is firm and unflinching upon

the great change which I have witnessed—the education of the people, unfettered by party or by sect—witnessed from the beginning of its progress, I may say from the hour of its birth. Yes! It was not for a humble man like me to assist at royal births, with the illustrious Prince who condescended to grace the pageant of this opening session, or the great Captain and statesman in whose presence I am now proud to speak. But with that illustrious Prince, and with the father of the Queen, I assisted at that other birth, more conspicuous still. With them, and with the head of the house of Russell, incomparably more illustrious in my eyes, I watched over its cradle—I marked its growth—I rejoiced in its strength—I witnessed its maturity—I have been spared to see it ascend the very height of supreme power; directing the councils of state; accelerating every great improvement; uniting itself with every good work; propping all useful institutions; extirpating abuses in all our institutions; passing the bounds of our European dominion, and in the New world, as in the Old, proclaiming that freedom is the birthright of man—that distinction of colour gives no title to oppression—that the chains now loosened must be struck off, and even the marks they have left effaced—proclaiming this by the same eternal law of our nature which makes nations the masters of their own destiny, and which in Europe has caused every tyrant's throne to quake! But they need feel no alarm at the progress of light who defend a limited monarchy, and support popular institutions—who place their chiefest pride not in ruling over slaves, be they white or be they black, not in protecting the oppressor, but in wearing a constitutional crown, in holding the sword of justice with the hand of mercy, in being the first citizen of a country whose air is too pure for slavery to breathe, and on whose shores, if the captive's foot but touch, his fetters of themselves fall off. To the resistless progress of this great principle I look with a confidence which nothing can shake; it makes all improvement certain; it makes all change safe which it produces; for none can be brought about, unless all has been prepared in a cautious and salutary spirit. So now the fulness of time is come for at length discharging our duty to the African captive. I have demonstrated to you that every thing is ordered—every previous step taken—all safe, by experience shewn to be safe, for the long-desired consummation. The time has come, the trial has been made, the hour is striking: you have no longer a pretext for hesitation, or faltering, or delay. The slave has shown, by four years' blameless behaviour, and devotion to the pursuits of peaceful industry, that he is as fit for his freedom as any English peasant, aye or any lord whom I now address. I demand his rights: I demand his liberty without stint. In the name of justice and of law—in the name of reason—in the name of God, who has given you no right to work injustice—I demand that your brother be no longer trampled upon as your slave! I make my appeal to the Commons, who represent the free people of England; and I require at their hands the performance of that condition for which they paid so enormous a price—that condition which all their constituents are in breathless anxiety to see fulfilled! I appeal to this House. Hereditary judges of

the first tribunal in the world*—to you I appeal for justice ! Patrons of all the arts that humanize mankind—under your protection I place humanity herself ! To the merciful Sovereign of a free people, I call aloud for mercy to the hundreds of thousands for whom half a million of her Christian sisters have cried aloud—I ask that their cry may not have risen in vain. But first I turn my eye to the Throne of all Justice, and devoutly humbling myself before Him who is of purer eyes than to behold such vast iniquities, I implore that the curse hovering over the head of the unjust and the oppressor may be averted from us—that your hearts may be turned to mercy—and that over all the earth His will may at length be done !”

Surpassed by Lord Brougham alone, and surpassed by him only in the warmth of colouring, in the glowing terms of imagery, in the unmatched power of sarcasm, and in the overpowering torrent of invective, which distinguish the speeches of that noble and learned Lord ; but superior to him in the capability of persuasion, which it is the chief business of an orator to effect, for

“ He hath prosperous art
When he will play with reason and discourse ;
And well he can persuade ;”

combining in his orations mathematical calculation, in its most enlarged sense, yet descending to the minutest particulars with the most consummate logical skill and ratiocination ; allowing nothing to divert him from his purpose, or interrupt the course of his reasoning for a moment, but travelling on in a chain of the most even, consecutive, and best regulated induction, in a category of apparent facts—step by step to the conclusion, not merely evincing, but forcing conviction, LORD LYNDHURST, if not the first, is in the very first rank of orators.

Whilst Lord Brougham addresses, through the House of Lords, the great mass of the people, Lord Lyndhurst speaks only to and for the Peers themselves, and the difference in the method of the two orators, arising doubtless from this circumstance, is precisely the difference remarked by Swift to exist between the orations of Cicero and Demosthenes, when he says, “ Demosthenes, who had to deal with a people of much more politeness, learning, and wit, laid the greatest weight of his oratory on the strength of his arguments, offered to their understanding and reason ; whilst Tully considered the dispositions of a sincere, more ignorant, and less mercurial people, by dwelling on the pathetic.” In the characteristic designation, by pithy

* This part of Lord Brougham's peroration is much after the manner of the Earl of Chatham's well-known and eloquent reply to Lord Suffolk. Indeed, in several parts of his speeches, Lord Brougham exhibits a great love for what, from the few recorded specimens, we may conclude to have been the style of Lord Chatham.

appellations of individuals and of bodies of men, Lord Lyndhurst is without an equal. All must recollect his notorious *alien* denunciation, and few will forget his playful and witty, yet accurate description of the municipal corporation commissioners, now calling one "a firm unflinching Whig," now describing another as "a strong and staunch Whig," whilst a third rejoiced in the designation of "a determined Whig," and not a few bear unto this day the appellation of "a Whig and something more;" yet thus with varying phrase he described them (save one alone) to be Whigs all. His great delight appears to be, and in this he excels all others, to leave unnoticed an accumulation of blunders and errors on the part of his political opponents, and then to overwhelm them with the plain but cutting recital of their errors of omission and commission, and to describe the danger of the course which they have been pursuing, in justice not only to his own opposition to their measures, but also in vindication of the sometimes not very popular steps which he has led his own friends to take. On these occasions, stating detail after detail in the best possible order for his argument, he follows out every measure, and in his passing comments upon each, says, in a few emphatic sentences, what to most would cost the expenditure of much time, and lead to still greater trouble. As was well observed by Mr. Foster, in his *Life* of the patriot Elliot, "Demos-thenic strength and closeness of reasoning, clearness of detail, and appalling earnestness of style, are all observable" in the speeches of Lord Lyndhurst. A better specimen of his most polished style cannot perhaps be found than in his speech on the 3rd August, 1835, on the English Corporation Bill, when he thus urged the value of the retention of the corporations:—

"I will remind your Lordships, that these corporations are copies, imperfect copies I allow, of the three estates of the realm; and yet they are to be annihilated, for what purpose I cannot tell, unless the new corporations are to serve as models for a change of constitution in this House. It will come to that. There will be no defence to the Church, no defence to our own privileges, if we surrender the corporations to condemnation unheard. Our case would be like that of a single house left standing in a street which has been pulled down, and which the owner would at last be forced to abandon. Pause, my Lords,—consider. At all events, do no act of injustice. I know the *civium ardor prava jubentium* will not operate here, and that your Lordships will, by your justice and firmness, save others from wrong, and your own proper influence from diminution."

Nor is he less eloquent or less impressive when he answers the very numerous attacks which are made upon himself. Few can more effectively, none more readily, exculpate themselves

from the accusations which have been put forward. Thus, at the end of the session of 1835, on the 4th September, when the Lords had made amendments upon amendments in the Corporation Bill, which they had been led to adopt on the recommendation of Lord Lyndhurst, his Lordship replied to the charges advanced against himself in the following energetic sentences :—

“ Your Lordships must be aware how much I have been assailed during these (the Municipal Corporation) discussions, both in and out of Parliament, and how many attacks have been made upon me personally on account of the course which I have felt it to be my duty to pursue with regard to this bill. Allow me also to say, that I should not be ashamed to have been a volunteer in my attacks upon this bill; but the fact is, that I have been no volunteer. Many noble lords with whom I have been in the habit of acting for years, and who thought that, from my professional habits, I was calculated to lead their efforts to a successful resistance against the objectionable clauses in this bill, requested me to undertake the management of the opposition to it; I yielded to their suggestions, and having done so, I have endeavoured to discharge my duty to them and to my country, firmly, strenuously, and to the best of my ability. I have been charged with having some party views to accomplish, some indirect ambition to gratify by this opposition. I deny it at once and for ever; all my ambition has been long since satisfied. I have twice, to borrow a phrase from these municipal corporations, passed that chair (pointing to the woolsack). I have twice, to borrow a phrase from a successful revolutionary usurper, had that splendid bauble (pointing to the Chancellor's mace) before me. Whatever ambitious views I may have had in early life, have all been fulfilled. My ambition has been gratified. I have no wishes unfulfilled.”

All his excellencies, however, were exhibited yet more strongly in his celebrated *catalogue raisonnée* of the doings, the misdoings, and the non-doings of the session of 1836. He there says,—

“ My Lords, it is impossible to enter into a consideration, however general, of the subjects to which I am about to direct your attention, without referring to his Majesty's Speech at the commencement of the present session, and without contrasting the brilliant anticipations contained in that speech, with the sad reality that has since occurred; a result as disproportioned in execution to the expectations that were held out, as the lofty position of the noble Viscount at that period, to what he will allow me to style his humble condition at the present moment. Gazing on these two pictures, one is tempted to apply to the noble Lord that which was said of a predecessor of his in the high office of first minister of the crown, and who, in the careless confidence of his character, bore some resemblance to the noble Viscount,

‘ His promises were, as he then was—mighty;
His performance as he now is—nothing.’ ”

And then commencing with the law reforms, describing the Chancery reform as still-born, and declaring that he would not disturb its ashes, he proceeds to comment on a clause in the Stannaries Courts' Bill, which made the judges of that court dependant on the crown. After declaring that, by the Act of Settlement, the independence of the judges was firmly established, and that the bill of a reforming and Whig government was the first exception to the general rule, he asks who was the great defender of this first infringement of so just a principle? *Proh pudor!* he adds,—

“ It was, my Lords, the noble Baron opposite (Lord Holland), he whom I have always been accustomed to regard as a sort of concentration of Whig liberality and constitutional principle ; he it was that stepped forward to vindicate this clause, and to combat the arguments of my noble and learned friends. True it is that this part of his argument was delivered in a subdued tone, not very audible in this part of the house—scarcely audible below the bar—or above the bar. But it was urged with vigour, with skill, with address, and all those arts so familiar to the noble Baron, in which he so much excels, and which, had he lived in the days of ancient Greece, would have entitled him to a high rank among the fraternity of Sophists of that celebrated period.”

Following this course, and thus describing the different measures promised and proposed, and commenting on the alterations effected in some at the suggestion of his own friends, and the withdrawal or abandonment of others on the recommendation of some supporters of government, Lord Lyndhurst brings himself to the following peroration :—

“ And this, my Lords, is a government ! Was there ever, in the history of this country, a body of men who would have condescended to carry on the government under such circumstances ? In this House they are utterly powerless—they can effect nothing. We on this side are obliged to perform the duties of the government for them. In the other House of Parliament, measures which they themselves have advised, and prepared, and brought forward, involving, as they tell us, the most important interests of the country, they without scruple tamely abandon at the dictation of a section of their supporters. Yet, thus disgraced and trampled upon, they still condescend to hold the reins of government.—Proud men ! Eminent statesmen ! Distinguished and high-minded rulers ! But is this description of their domestic policy countervailed by the splendour of their foreign administration ? Is the gloomy and wretched state of the one side of Downing-street relieved by the brilliant glories of the other ? My Lords, this is a fruitful topic for consideration and discussion, but too extensive for the present occasion. I will imitate the prudence and reserve of my noble friend, the noble Duke, and leave it to each individual among your Lordships to consider whether the measures and policy pursued by his Majesty's Government have been such as to ensure the confidence and command the respect of other nations.

Whether they have been calculated to induce them to court or to shun our alliance—to lead them to regard us with feelings of favour, or of distrust and aversion. But, my Lords, it is impossible not to pause for a moment in considering their policy with respect to Spain. By their intervention, so much in opposition to their former principles,—by their measures with respect to that country, they have wasted between one and two millions sterling of the public treasure—and what have they obtained in return? Disappointment, defeat, and disgrace. They have compromised the honour of their sovereign, and tarnished the reputation and character of their country. In looking at Spain, it is impossible not to recollect that it was the cradle of those brilliant exploits by which our late great and arduous struggle was so remarkably distinguished; that it was in that land that those armies were formed, which achieving victory after victory, led on by the skill and conduct of the noble Duke, raised the military glory of the country to a height scarcely ever attained at any former period of our history. It would seem as if some envious and malignant demon, eager to sully this reputation, had suggested, as a fit means, that miserable buccaneering expedition, patronized by the government, but so unworthy a great and powerful nation, which has rendered us odious to Spain, and ridiculous and contemptible to the rest of the world. And yet the noble Viscount stands erect and confident amid these accumulated disasters and disgraces, and, reversing the rule of the poet, is swelling and lofty in his tone and language, in proportion to the fallen and abject state of his fortunes, and the reeling and staggering condition of his government. In former times, amid such defeats, and unable to carry those measures which he considered essential, a minister would have thought that he had only one course to pursue. But these are antiquated notions—every thing has changed! This fastidious delicacy forms no part of the character of the noble Viscount. He has told us, and his acts correspond with his assertions, that notwithstanding the insubordination that prevails around him, in spite of the mutinous and sullen temper of his crew, he will stick to the vessel whilst a single plank remains afloat. Let me, however, as a friendly adviser of the noble Viscount, recommend him to get her as speedily as possible into still water:—

‘ Fortiter occupa
Portum.’

Let the noble Lord look to the empty benches around him,—

‘ Nonne vides ut
Nudum remigio latus.
• • • •
Vix durare carinæ
Possint imperiosius
Æquor?’

After all, there is something in the efforts and exertions of the noble Viscount, not altogether unamusing or uninteresting. It is impossible, too, under any circumstances, not to respect

‘ The brave man struggling in the storms of fate,’

May a part, at least, of what follows, be averted,—

‘ And greatly falling with a falling state.’

My consolation is, that, whatever be the disposition of the noble Viscount, he has not sufficient strength, though his locks, I believe, are yet unshorn, to pull down the pillars of the building, and to involve the whole in his ruin. I trust it will long survive his fall.”

Although he no longer takes part in the debates of the Upper House, we must not omit to notice, among the orators of the present day, one who, for nearly half a century, has occupied a high place in the affections of the people,—who having in his early life espoused the popular cause from conviction, and not from “mere youthful vanity or pride of place,” deserted it not in his old days, but advocated it, and clung to it to the last hour of his political life with the affection and the intensity of a first love.

Having lived through two generations of orators, and having heard and studied in the palmy days of senatorial oratory the brightest specimens of English eloquence, EARL GREY preserved some of the best features of the best style. He was deeply imbued also with purely Attic oratory, to which all his speeches preserve a close resemblance. Throughout the whole of his addresses, like the orators of Athens, he imitated the language of conversation, being, however, more diffuse and lofty; there was nothing faulty or impertinent in them; he made every thing he discoursed upon rather clear and open, than great and striking; although, what was also a characteristic of Atticism, he occasionally spoke floridly, nervously, and copiously. Still, however, he sought not for, though he produced, effect; he used few ornaments or images; he applied himself closely to the matter in hand, never hunting after flowery expressions, or other than elegant and appropriate words to convey his meaning, so as to be understood by every one,—appealing to the sympathies of human nature, and calling up the feelings of the human breast in the most simple but effective manner: and he thus formed that contrast to Lord Brougham, which Quintillian has stated to have existed between the greatest masters of oratory in ancient times. Earl Grey is more compact, Lord Brougham more copious; “the one hems you close in,—the other fights at weapon’s length; the one studies still, as it were, to pierce by keenness,—and the other to bear you down with the fulness and the weight of his discourse; in the one there is nothing that can be curtailed,—in the other nothing that can be added.” Earl Grey’s speeches, too, were polished with the utmost neatness and accuracy; every word is as exactly in the place where it should

be, and disposed with as much nicety as in a curious piece of Mosaic work : —

“ Quàm lepidè lexeis compostæ ? ut tesserulæ omnes
Arte pavimento, atque emblemate vermiculato.”*

In short, Earl Grey was almost a perfect specimen of a finished Athenian orator. His great fault was, that he was somewhat deficient in imagination; but this defect was supplied by the readiness with which he could invent such arguments as were most to the point, and afterwards digest and methodize them to the best advantage, retaining them in the place that he had formed with great exactness; carefully avoiding, on all occasions, what Hazlitt calls “those circular ladders and winding stair-cases in language, where the whole hangs suspended in an airy round, and the meaning drops down through the middle.” Although unfitted to address a crowded audience, who require an orator who is enlivened, full of action, and able to exert his voice to the highest pitch, yet, speaking through the Houses of Parliament to the nation at large, Earl Grey, in his reported speeches, produced a greater effect, and induced a stronger conviction, than any of his contemporaries. He was not raised above others by being superior to the common interests, prejudices, and passions of mankind, but by feeling them in a more intense degree than they do; and hence his addresses when heard in the House and when read by the people, were found to contain that force which is said to be the sole characteristic excellence of an orator.

The dignity, the force, and withal, the simplicity of Earl Grey’s style, was perhaps best exhibited in a single point in his able reply, on the third reading of the Reform Bill, 4th June, 1832, when he exclaimed—

“ I have been charged, my Lords, with having trampled upon the crown and this House. I—I trample upon the crown—I, holding opinions, perhaps prejudices, as dear to me as my heart’s blood to my life—I trample on this House—I, who have ever held, and shall ever hold, that the independence and privileges of your Lordships are essential to the permanence of the institutions of the country—I to be told these things, when following a course of duty which, in my conscience, I believe was the only means of averting immediate danger, and, I should fear, destruction both to the crown and this House:—it is, indeed, too bad.”

It would be easy to select other specimens of the power and

* “ As in the chequer’d pavement every square
Is nicely fitted by the mason’s care;
So all thy words are plac’d with curious art,
And ev’ry syllable performs its part.”

beauty of his Lordship's orations prior to the passing of that measure, which was the crowning honour of his life, but this retrospect forms no part of our present purpose; and as his Lordship delivered afterwards but few speeches worthy of his fame, we shall content ourselves with the following extracts from his retiring address, delivered with soul-stirring effect, though in a subdued tone, on the 9th July, 1834. After detailing the reasons which had led him to resign, and having alluded to the difficulties under which public affairs laboured, when he was induced to take the reins of government, his Lordship thus proceeded:—

“ I look with satisfaction upon the state in which I now leave the affairs of this country. It has been frequently, indeed, said, that we have done nothing. Was reform in Parliament nothing? Was the passing of that delicate and difficult measure, the abolition of the colonial slavery, nothing? Was the settlement of the East India charter, and the opening of the trade of our extensive dominions in India, nothing? Was the arrangement of the question as to the Bank charter nothing? Are the various improvements in the law, of which the whole credit is due to my noble and learned friend on the woolsack (Lord Brougham), nothing? Were those reforms in the Irish Church, on account of which we have been reproved on one side that we have done too much—were they, and can they with truth, be said to be nothing? . . . I leave the government with the satisfaction, at least, that, in having used my best endeavours to carry into effect those measures of reform that the country required, I have not shrunk from any obstacles, or from meeting and grappling with the many difficulties that I have encountered in the performance of my duty. How I have performed it, is a matter that is now before your Lordships and the country; all I ask from you in considering it, is, that you will not hastily, as I am sure you cannot justly, accuse me of idleness and remissness in the performance of that duty. I have been attacked on the one side for going too far: I have been assailed on the other for not going far enough; and these attacks were made when I have been standing in this House, deprived of the support which a minister of the crown might naturally expect to receive here, and checked and fettered in every instance whatever. Under these circumstances, I have done all that I could, and I will assert without hesitation, that the government of which I have formed a part, has done much more since our being in office, than has been done for half a century before, for the improvement of the political condition of the country. Let it be recollected, too, that we have effected these improvements, when the evils were the accumulated evils of ages, which, till that time, no sufficient attempt had been made in any way to reduce. Under such circumstances, and under the pressure of a necessity which I could not avoid, I have resigned into his Majesty's hands the trust which he had been pleased to confide in me.”

And then, having vindicated himself from the accusation of nepotism, he thus pathetically and beautifully concluded:—

“ I may have much to account for to your Lordships and to the country, with respect to the ability with which I have discharged my duty ; but I trust that I shall stand excused in your Lordships’ and in my country’s opinion, for any departure from the principles which I have professed, or for any deviation from that conduct which became a man of honour. Whilst I have health and strength left me, I shall continue to attend in my place in Parliament as an individual peer, and to assist in promoting those views which I conceive to be the best for the general interests of the country.”

And thus becomingly ended the political life of the most high-minded, the most consistent, and the most philosophical statesman, the most classical orator, and the most able advocate of the rights of the people, in modern times ; and thus retired from office the people’s chief “ in all rational and just improvement ; their moderator when their zeal and unformed opinions would lead them too far,—and on all occasions their protector,—and as truly a minister after their own heart, as he was certainly the servant of the king’s gracious choice.”

Of the style of the BISHOP OF EXETER (Dr. Philpotts), it is impossible to convey any thing like a correct notion by mere extracts. There is an entire absence of all those tropes and figures, which constitute much of the charm in the oratory of the noble and learned Lords to whom we have already referred ; wanting the terseness of either, without any attempt at wit or satire, the Bishop of Exeter seeks to convince by an apparent earnestness of manner, a felicitous selection of topics, and an almost unanswerable combination of details ; and it is as a finished whole, without peculiar excellence in any part, that his speeches entitle him to the designation of an orator. With the greatest care he selects from all sources facts and statements supporting his own views, and then, in one continuous and acute logical arrangement, he so entwines facts, and comments, and arguments, as to carry conviction to the minds of his auditors, and to defy an immediate answer from his opponents ; whilst there is an evenness in his diction, a charming choice of words which please the ear, and a pungency in his comments, which render interesting even his longest and driest statements. Occasionally, however, he uses, in a few sentences, the most piercing sarcasm, as where, in his speech on the 1st March on Catholic oaths, having referred to Lord John Russell’s denunciation of his charge to his clergy as a libellous publication, he thus alludes to Lord John’s reason for not prosecuting the alleged libel :—

“ Now the noble Lord gave the same reason last year as he does now, for not prosecuting me for this libellous charge, and that was, that it is too contemptible a course to be adopted. But I must remark on the

contempt of the noble Lord (and it is a curiosity in the history of the human passions and feelings, for contempt usually broods on in silence), that it is of a peculiar kind, and is constantly forcing itself forward. No one can doubt that the noble Lord does not hold the person to whom I have before alluded (Mr. O'Connell) in contempt. Probably he has not more respect for that individual than I have for him, but it is extraordinary that this person, who acknowledges himself the master of the government councils, who vaunts himself the dictator of the country, and the annihilator of the Church of Ireland, should be constantly supported by the noble Lord. I do not understand such a mode of shewing contempt as that adopted by the noble Lord."

The audience are in a great measure enchanted with his manner of expression; and his sly, subtle method of introducing a charge, gradually and insensibly insinuates itself into their belief. And thus the Bishop of Exeter, now commenting on the evils of the Irish national system of instruction,—now arguing that those Catholics who have taken the oath prescribed by the Emancipation Act, and have since voted on questions relating to the temporalities of the Church, have been guilty of "treachery, aggravated by perjury,"—again condemning, in no measured terms, the theology of Dens,—and ever and anon urging the sufferings and hardships endured by the poor under the administration of the Poor-Law Amendment Act,—always obtains for himself a ready hearing, and succeeds in impressing not only the minds of many of his auditors in the House, but of those who read his speeches without the walls of Parliament, with the seeming justice of the remarks which he has made, and with the enormity of the evils which he has denounced. Nor is the effect lessened, or the prejudices which he has created in any manner removed, when accused, as he often is, of the distortion of the opinions and statements of others; he returns to the charge with great plausibility, and by an invigorated re-statement of the details, seems to bear out, if not to the very letter, at least the spirit of his former remarks.

Some quarter of a century has elapsed since Byron, in a description of the orators of his day, declared the MARQUIS OF LANSDOWNE to be "good, but a mere debater;" and presuming that the poet's estimate at that period was accurate, his Lordship has since made considerable advances; for, without losing any of his great power as a debater, he now presents a fair claim to be ranked with the orators in the Upper House. Not, indeed, that he can be classed with the masters either of simple or of impassioned oratory; but he can take a station in that middle class in which Cicero says that the eloquence flows along in an uniform course. It intermingles a number of decorations, like the tufts of flowers in a garland, and embellishes a discourse from begin-

ning to end with the moderate and less striking ornaments of language and sentiment. In all his addresses, his Lordship shows distinct evidence of deep reading, and that intimate acquaintance with the best models, both ancient and modern, which enables his polished mind so to shape his own efforts, as to avoid, on all occasions, the utterance of any thing offensive or commonplace; and he has a happy method of delivery, especially when animated and warmed by the pressure of debate, which makes every word not only please the ear, but produce great effect upon his auditors. Some of the best specimens of his style in latter years, are to be found in his replies to Lord Lyndhurst, particularly on the question of granting municipal corporations to Ireland, in the year 1836. There is great purity in his language; and although there is in all his speeches an abundance of appropriate words and terms, rather than great accumulation of matter, yet, as in his speech in answer to Lord Brougham's motion relative to Sardinian vessels, on 10th July, 1838, one of the best which Lord Lansdowne delivered during the session, he states with precision and clearness, in his opening sentences, as a kind of thesis, the real point in debate, and weeding the discussion of all extraneous matter, proceeds logically to advance and argue his own views, and pressing the arguments of his opponents almost to an absurdity, he seldom fails, at the conclusion, to bring his hearers to his own deduction. All the weapons of argument are employed by him without violence, but he informs, reasons with, and amuses, rather than fires and inflames his audience, and he wants, therefore, the force possessed by the orators whom we have already noticed.

Among the junior members of the Upper House, he who has given the greatest promise of future oratorical excellence, is the BISHOP OF NORWICH (Dr. Stanley). His sentences are full of thought and beauty,—they are not encumbered with unnecessary verbiage,—but there is a fulness in his periods, and an elegance in the choice of his words, which draw along with him all the sympathies of his hearers. The only speech of any length which he has delivered since his elevation, was in reply to the Bishop of Exeter's attack on the national system of education in Ireland, on 25th May, and though delivered in that nervous and hurried manner, almost inseparable from a first attempt before an unaccustomed audience, yet the reply completely answered, item by item, the previous attack. Indeed, nothing could have been better than the following peroration, breathing sentiments worthy of a Christian prelate, and no less perfect as an oratorical composition, than it was effective in its delivery:—

“ If,” said his Lordship, “ we cannot do all that we wish, let us at least do all that we can. If we cannot compel the Roman Catholics to read the Bible, let us show in our own persons, by our conciliatory spirit, and by our Protestant Christianity, that we have read the Bible ourselves, and that we wish to practise its precepts. On these *data*, and on these alone, let us stretch forth the hand of fellowship, with the Bible in it, to our Roman Catholic subjects. ‘That they will receive it in time, I have no doubt. I could read evidence on evidence, and passage after passage, to show that the more the Bible is known the more it is valued—that the short extracts (contained in the books in use in the schools), in consequence of being accidentally received by the people, excite a curiosity which is never satisfied until they have in their hands the whole sacred volume. It is often complained that the Roman Catholics are barbarians [cries of ‘no, no!’]. Has it never been said that they are men who cannot be believed on their oaths, and that their worship is idolatrous? Surely these are harsh expressions. If they are barbarous and ignorant—perhaps the lower orders may be subject to the charge—whose fault is it but ours, who, for six hundred years, have kept them in that ignorance? It is not for me to remind your Lordships, who must be well informed and instructed in history, that it was not until very late years, indeed within the memory of man, that the penalty which, though I forget what exactly it was, I know to be a heavy one, was taken off from those who educated their children in the religion to which they belonged. Surely, then, if you have left and kept them so long in ignorance, now, when they have tasted the sweets of civil liberty, the advancement of education and religious instruction is a debt which we still owe them. The Bible will circulate, whether you will or no, if you give it fair play, and do not thrust it forcibly on the prejudices of the people. There is something in the heart of man which is attracted by it. We have been told of the mutilation of the Scriptures. Mutilate them as you may—the more you destroy, the more valuable, like the books of the sibyl, becomes that which is preserved. I take the first sentence which catches my eye in these little books :—‘ Glory to God in the highest, and on earth peace, good will towards men.’ Take that single sentence—scatter that mutilated extract over the land—let it go forth as a glorious wanderer in Ireland; and depend upon it, that, by a judicious system of national education, it will soon cease to be a wanderer, for it will find a home and a resting-place in every hovel in Ireland.”

Here, however, we must bring our remarks, for the present, to a conclusion, reserving for a future occasion, sketches of the orators in the more popular branch of the Legislature.

- ART. VIII.—1. *Historical and Political Essay upon the Belgian Revolution.* By Northomb. Brussels. 1834.
2. *Belgium and the Twenty-four Articles.* By M. B. C. du Mortier. Translated by Charles Whyte, Esq. Brussels. 1838.
3. *An Exposition of the Financial System of King William.* By G. S. Ansiane. Brussels. 1833.
4. *The Kingdom of the Low Countries.* By the Baron de Reverberg. Brussels. 1835.

AFTER the enjoyment of eight years of prosperous and peaceful independence, Belgium is now threatened with the loss of an important portion of her territory. The King of Holland, by his tardy acceptance of the Twenty-four Articles, claims a portion of Limbourg and Luxembourg; and the plenipotentiaries of the great European powers are called upon to give up to his dominion, and perhaps to his vengeance, 400,000 souls, unanimous in their hatred to Holland, and unanimous in their protestations against the yoke which they cast off in 1830. Like the Jew of Venice, King William demands the literal execution of the contract forced upon his unfortunate debtor. The scales are ready, the weights and the knife that is to cut off the pound of flesh are in his hands. One more protocol, and the hatred of the modern Shylock will be gratified, the sacrifice will be accomplished. But England and France are equally interested in saving unhappy Belgium from a disastrous mutilation that may perhaps be fatal to the throne which their powerful co-operation largely contributed to establish in Brussels. Will they yield to the exactions of the absolute governments? Will they permit them—to the injury even of Holland itself, as we will presently demonstrate—to obtain a diplomatic triumph which will increase the moral force of the European despots, and in an equal degree diminish the confidence which other nations place in the union or the power of the only two countries in which the cause of constitutional liberty is at present represented? We will not allege the situation of Prussia or of Austria, the one crippled by the intolerant bigotry of its king, and the other by the legitimate and deeply-felt dissatisfaction of its Italian subjects.* We will not urge that Russia, occupied with the subjugation of her Polish subjects, is less powerful for aggres-

* This observation was written before the publication of the Italian amnesty, the results of which we anticipate with hopes chequered with fears. Greatly should we rejoice if we could entertain any expectation of the removal of all causes of complaint.

sion than for resistance. No doubt these considerations should have their weight in the councils of England and France. Nevertheless, if justice required of them to forsake their young ally,—if Holland, as a nation, was interested in obtaining this sacrifice,—if there were no other conditions by which the 'Twenty-four Articles could be carried into execution at least in spirit,—we could understand that the faith of England and France might be held pledged to make these concessions, although dangerous to them both. Happily, however, we shall have no difficulty in proving, with the assistance of the works before us, that without any violation of the treaty they so imprudently signed, these two powers have *a right* to reject what is most adverse to their own interests and to those of Belgium, in the pretensions of King William. The treaties of 1815 created the kingdom of the Low Countries, with the especial intention of restricting France within her old limits, by establishing upon her frontier an independent state, which should always afford a free passage to the troops of her enemies. At that period we expended not less than £2,000,000 in establishing fortresses to form a barrier against our ancient rival, forgetting that, in the altered position of Europe, it was from Russia and not France that we were to look for a new Napoleon, if the human race were to be cursed by the appearance of another conqueror. This mistaken policy of ours contributed greatly to revive or to influence the prejudices entertained by the French against England. Every dispassionate Frenchman would have easily understood, that, by the union of Belgium to France, though the national pride might be gratified, little addition would really be made to the power of a nation, whose chief strength lies in the homogeneity of all its parts, and the admirable moral and territorial unity of its provinces. But they could not be expected to witness, without secret indignation, the erection of a state within sixty leagues of their capital, under the influence of their enemies, and always disposed to join with them in case of war. The kingdom of the Low Countries, although too feeble in itself to attack France, was yet powerful enough to inspire her with uneasiness and reasonable suspicions; and thus it became obviously the policy of France to overthrow the edifice which had been built up with so much pains by the Treaty of Vienna. Now, by the Belgian revolution, she has obtained what she desired,—a desire suggested by reasonable anxiety for her own security. Belgium is her natural ally; she cannot in future act against France, whose northern frontier is thus relieved from all danger of sudden invasion. But this security will lose much of its value, if King William should obtain possession of the larger part of the Duchy of Luxembourg.

An important though more distant part of the French frontier will, in that case, be exposed; and, consequently, the government of that country cannot rest satisfied without one or other of these two alternatives,—either the entire possession of Belgium, or its continuance in its present state. But to the first of these alternatives England can never consent; and as the peace of Europe evidently depends upon an intimate alliance being maintained between ourselves and France, it will be most unwise in us not to secure to the cabinet of Paris all that we can give up without danger to ourselves, namely, that Belgium shall be sufficiently extensive to serve as a rampart to a portion of the French frontier against the assaults of Russia. There are few people who do not see how little we have now to fear from the increase of French influence; for our true rival at present is Russia; and France, attached to our destinies by institutions analogous to our own, will be our natural ally, in the wars that must one day break out between the cause of absolutism and that of liberty. It is the interest, therefore, of this country that France should not be thrown into the arms of an enemy always ready to buy her support by concessions of territory; and this consideration, were there no other, should induce our ministers by no means to withhold their concurrence in any measures which France may adopt in favour of the son-in-law of *Louis-Philippe*. But this motive is by no means the only one which should influence us in favour of Belgium. In a commercial point of view, her present importance, great as it is, bears no comparison to that which she must hereafter acquire. No doubt she may already claim merit for her considerable yearly consumption of English merchandise, and for her territorial position, so favourable for the continual, though clandestine introduction of English produce into France, and even into Germany. But it is not merely as another Heligoland, a convenient station for smugglers, that she is principally entitled to our good-will. Far higher destinies are reserved for her; since we must consider her as a battering-engine which must, sooner or later, be brought into active operation. The adoption of railways, which are already in a state of great forwardness in Belgium, must, in the end, lead France, on one hand, and Prussia, on the other, to follow her example, and to carry forward the Belgian lines of railway, the one to Paris, the other to Cologne. Already are the Rhenish provinces actively employed in fulfilling their part of this double undertaking; and the French government must speedily take up theirs, if they wish to satisfy the departments of the north. Now, we ask, when every morning five or six hundred travellers shall set out from Antwerp to the borders of the Rhine, and from Brussels to Paris,

how will it be possible for the French and Prussian custom-houses to search the luggage of such a multitude of persons, without such a loss of time as would neutralize the advantages of this mode of travelling, and thereby occasion universal indignation? It is clear that every line of custom-houses which is traversed by a railway, must thereby become inefficient. Freedom of commerce and locomotives must make their way together. If you do not repulse the one, you open a door to the other. And steam will do more to overthrow the barriers that human folly has erected between nations which use this method of communication, than the writings of all the economists. In this view of the matter, if our merchants and manufacturers wish that the French market may be opened to them, and that the market of the Prussian line may not eventually be closed against them, they ought earnestly to desire the maintenance, in all its integrity, of the Belgian territory; because, unless that is preserved, it is in vain to expect the extension of the railways from which they will derive these advantages; and for this reason, if that country is parcelled out by the literal execution of the Twenty-four Articles, its internal tranquillity will be greatly compromised. The Belgians will think their national honour tarnished, should their fellow-countrymen, who are placed in the same situation as themselves, by an insurrection in which all took an equal part, be violently separated from their common country; and they will find it difficult to pardon their sovereign for his consent to such a measure, however involuntary it may have been. Popular dissatisfaction will manifest itself; and the harmony now existing between Leopold and the new nation which he governs, will be destroyed, perhaps for ever. Besides this, a perpetual cause of fermentation will have been established on the frontier. The inhabitants of those parts of Limbourg and Luxembourg ceded to Holland, will not submit without resistance. They are too deeply compromised, to place much reliance on the clemency of a prince whom they detest; and Luxembourg especially, with its forests and ravines, affords such opportunities for resistance as to leave scarcely a doubt that the military occupation of the province will become indispensable; and this could not take place, and still less could it be maintained, without effusion of blood. Can it be supposed that the men of Belgium will not repay to their brothers of Luxembourg that assistance which they always so liberally received from them? Neither arms, nor provisions, nor succour of any kind, we may be sure, would be wanting to the insurgents, and that as often as there should be any. In vain would King Leopold interfere to prevent this; he would find no jury to condemn the guilty, because public opinion would

have acquitted them beforehand. And at last Holland would be obliged either to declare war against Belgium, or to give up a territory which it would cost her more than its revenue to retain. Up to that point the irritation between her and Belgium would be excessive, and a collision between them would every moment be to be dreaded. In such a critical situation Belgium must relax the zeal with which she is now following up plans of improvement; and her railways, stopping short of their ultimate developement, would no longer offer to this country the immense advantages we have a right to expect from them.

We have shewn that France, from regard to her external security, and Great Britain, for the future interests of her commerce, are equally interested in saving Belgium from the calamities with which at present she is threatened. We will now examine into the rights of the parties; and of the books before us we shall chiefly make use of the work of Baron Reverberg, the avowed champion of the King of Holland. We will begin by borrowing from him an account of the facts that brought about the revolution of September, to which Belgium owed its nationality. For supposing the *letter* of the Twenty-four Articles to be of any importance, the eternal rules of equity must also be taken into consideration; and the more it is made evident that the conditions upon which Belgium was annexed to Holland have been violated—the more will public opinion declare itself in favour of the country which King William for fifteen years severely exhausted and oppressed. If the sacred laws of nature,—if the Christian feelings of a Christian nation have at length prevailed over the personal interest and legal possession of the slave-holder, assuredly Belgium, with an equal claim to our protection, will not be denied the redress so liberally granted to our negro fellow-creatures. Holland, divided by Napoleon into French departments, rose at the approach of the victorious armies of the allied sovereigns; and when, on the 30th November, 1813, the Prince of Orange, who, at most, could be considered only as the representative of the ancient stadtholders, landed at Schevelingen, popular enthusiasm saluted him hereditary sovereign of the Old United Provinces; and the better to secure a title which his family had never possessed, he hastened to give a constitution to the descendents of the Barnevelts and of the De Witts. To effect his purpose, he convoked a certain number of citizens selected by himself, and to them he left it to accept or reject, in the name of the nation, the charter which his councillors had prepared. But such a convention as this was too open to suspicion, and too entirely devoted to the Prince, for its consent to the fundamental law to be considered as implying the approba-

tion of the great body of the people. It therefore became necessary to find some means of making the choice of the Prince appear to be that of the nation; and William succeeded in this with a skill the more remarkable—to say nothing of honesty—since he thereby established a precedent which he turned to singular advantage at a later period, and at the expense of Belgium. He ordered a register to be opened in each district, in which every inhabitant who *objected* to the citizen named by the Prince as his representative, should be at liberty to inscribe his name. Thus all such as could not write, or who feared to irritate a rich or powerful neighbour, those who were indifferent to passing events, the lazy and the lukewarm, were considered as approving the official nominees. And, accordingly, they were confirmed by an overwhelming majority of absentees; and on the 28th March, 1814, they unanimously accepted a constitution by which the ancient republican system was destroyed, and Holland transformed into an hereditary principality. It is but fair to add, that the new sovereign displayed astonishing activity in organizing an army, which rendered essential services to the allied sovereigns; but this army was raised by means of financial measures, which were a sort of prelude to that system that, in 1830, after fifteen years of peace, had added nearly £7,000,000 sterling to the national debt of the kingdom of the Low Countries. When Napoleon took possession of Holland, he reduced its old enormous debt, amounting to 1,719,000,000 of florins, (about £142,500,000) to a third of the nominal capital. A law passed by the Dutch legislature on the 14th May, 1814, revived, under the name of “postponed debt,” the two-thirds which France had effaced by a declaration of bankruptcy, and decreed that every year a part of these debentures, to the amount of the 4,000,000 of florins, appropriated as a sinking-fund, and drawn by lot, should be transferred to the active debt, or in other words, begin to bear interest. This boon, however, was not altogether a gratuitous one; an advance equal to at least $2\frac{1}{2}$ per cent. on each of the old debentures was required from the holders; and in an hour of peril, a loan of 30,000,000 of florins was thus raised, we need not point out at what a heavy cost, since it is obvious that all the benefit arising from the sinking-fund was thereby, and during many generations, given up for the purpose of reviving a debt long since considered as extinct by the creditors themselves. The Treaty of Paris, signed on the 30th March, 1814, had provided that Holland should receive an accession of territory; and the plenipotentiaries of the great powers decreed, in their conferences in the month of June following, that Belgium should be joined to it, and that they should form together the kingdom of

the Low Countries. Nothing but the desire of weakening France could have suggested the idea of uniting two nations as completely opposed to each other in habits and manners, and by the remembrance of an old antipathy, as by their language and their religion. But we must acknowledge that, when they brought about this ill-assorted union, the allied sovereigns required favourable conditions for Belgium from the Prince of Orange: they had taken her for their ward, and in disposing of her fate against her will, they acted honourably towards her in every other respect. On the 21st July, 1815, the Prince of Orange solemnly accepted the eight articles of this fatal contract, thus acknowledging—at least by implication—that he would forfeit his right to the obedience of the Belgians, from the moment when he should cease to observe them fully and faithfully. We shall transcribe only the first six articles of this curious document, because they alone are of any importance.

“ Article 1st. This union must be intimate and complete, so that the two countries may form but one and the same state, governed by the constitution already established in Holland, and which shall be modified by mutual agreement, according to new circumstances.

“ Article 2nd. No innovation shall be made in those articles of this constitution which secure to all religions *equal favour and protection*, and guarantee the admissibility of all citizens, whatever may be their religious opinions, into all public and official situations.

“ Article 3rd. The Belgic provinces shall be properly represented in the assembly of the States-General, whose ordinary sessions shall, in time of peace, be held alternately in a Dutch and a Belgian town.

“ Article 4th. The inhabitants of the Low Countries being thus constitutionally assimilated with each other, the different provinces shall equally enjoy all the commercial and other advantages which their respective situations allow of, and no fetter or restriction shall be imposed upon either for the benefit of the other.

“ Article 5th. Immediately after the union, the Belgian provinces and towns shall enter into a participation of the commerce and navigation of the colonies, upon the same terms as the provinces and towns of Holland.

“ Article 6th. As the burdens of the countries should be in common, as well as their advantages, the debts contracted up to the time of the union by the Dutch provinces on the one side, and those of Belgium on the other, shall thereafter form a charge upon the general treasury of the Low Countries.”

The battle of Waterloo had been fought, and the Prince of Orange had already assumed the title of King of the Netherlands; but his right, such as it was, over the Belgians, originated solely in the promise made by him to fulfil the above compact; and accordingly, he immediately appointed a committee of twenty-four members for the purpose of amending the Dutch

constitution, in the manner and to the extent prescribed by the allied sovereigns. On the 23rd July, 1815, their report was laid before the States-General of Holland, and unanimously approved, for this obvious reason, that it was drawn up in such a manner as to place the Belgians at the mercy of their Dutch fellow-subjects. An immense power was granted to the crown, and as the sovereign was a Dutchman by his prejudices as well as by his birth, the royal prerogative, they well knew, would be exerted in such a manner as must convert Belgium into another Ireland, a land "overflowing with milk and honey," not for the natives, but for their foreign rulers. Nor were the framers of the new charter satisfied with this pledge of the future servitude of the ceded provinces. They divided the kingdom into two distinct parts, the northern comprising Holland, and the southern Belgium, including the Duchy of Luxembourg, and they dared to propose that, for ever afterwards, the first part, of which the population amounted only to 2,071,182 inhabitants, should be entitled to the same number of representatives as the second division, notwithstanding its greater wealth, its far more extensive territory, and its population, which must of necessity increase rapidly, and which already amounted to 3,411,082 souls. It was thus rendered certain that Holland would have a perpetual preponderance in the legislature; for, on all questions that might arise between the northern provinces and those of the southern division, it required but the vote of a single Belgian representative to secure a majority for the Dutch interest; and certainly it was not presuming too much upon court patronage and power, to believe that, in the most unfavourable circumstances, they would always be able to seduce one vote at the least. But it was necessary to obtain the consent of Belgium herself to a constitution so unfavourable to her interests, and King William gained that point in the following manner. He convoked a meeting of 1600 *notables*, selected by himself from the southern provinces, for the purpose of examining what was to be the fundamental law of the land; 1325 only appeared, 529 voted for, and 769 against the new charter. Never certainly had the real tendency of public opinion been more clearly made manifest; since the sovereign himself could not find in all Belgium 1600 persons disposed to accept the project he had laid before them, and since out of those whom he himself had named, a majority of those that had obeyed his summons openly avowed their dissent. Any other prince would have so amended and modified his plan as to render it less unpalatable to the general feeling of the country. But King William was not inclined to take this trouble; and with a dexterity that the Tories will perhaps admire, he suc-

ceeded in changing an incontestable minority into an immense majority. We will give this admirable receipt in the very words of the head of the house of Orange: he expresses himself as follows in the proclamation, dated 24th August, 1815, by which he informed his new subjects of what assuredly they little suspected, namely, that they had accepted the new constitution.

“ Nearly a sixth of the persons summoned have not appeared at the meeting of *notables*; and although their absence may be looked upon as a proof of their adhesion to the plan of fundamental law, we should nevertheless have been better satisfied if none of them had neglected the opportunity of frankly stating his opinion, where the interests involved were so important. Of the 796 *notables* who have disapproved the project, 126 declared formally that their vote of disapprobation was grounded upon the articles concerning religion—articles which, being conformable to a long-established system of legislation, founded upon treaties, and in harmony with the principles introduced into the European system by most religious princes—could not have been left out of the constitution of the Low Countries, without placing the existence of the monarchy in a state of uncertainty, and without lessening the security for the rights even of those very persons who have been most alarmed by them. Had not this truth been kept out of sight by some men, from whom the social body might, on the contrary, have expected an example of charity and Christian toleration,—the above-mentioned votes would have been added to those of the 527 *notables* who have approved of the project. The States-General have also communicated to us their approbation, which is of the more weight, as having been pronounced unanimously in a very numerous assembly, it must be considered as the clearly-expressed opinion of all the northern provinces; and as, according to this enumeration and comparison of the votes respectively given, there can be no doubt of the sentiments and wishes of a majority of the whole body of our subjects; and as by it is evidently demonstrated the assent of this majority, we do not hesitate to comply with the obligation that is laid upon us, by formally sanctioning the project, which we caused to be laid before the States-General and *notables*, and by declaring, as we do now declare by these presents, that the several matters therein contained form, henceforward, the fundamental law of the kingdom of the Low Countries.”

No comment is necessary to point out the iniquity and fraud of this unexampled perversion of the most obvious facts. To take the *absence* of the 275 *notables* as a proof of their adhesion,—to confound the votes of Holland with those of Belgium,—of those who had all to gain by the new order of things, with the votes of those who had all to lose by it,—to set off the unanimity of the former against the dissatisfaction, in reality quite as unanimous, of the latter,—all this is certainly more than enough to immortalize the Machiavelian skill of King William. But this document is curious in another point of view; for, in the blame thrown indirectly upon the Catholic clergy, we see indications of

the design already conceived for extirpating the Catholic religion by the help of those articles which, *conformable to a long established system of legislation, . . . could not have been left out without bringing into question the existence of the monarchy.* And, in fact, the 193rd article authorized the executive power to put a stop to the exercise of the Catholic religion whenever it had been the occasion of any disturbance; the 196th article rendered the exercise of the Catholic religion subject to the laws of the state; and the 226th article gave to the sovereign the exclusive right of regulating public instruction, that is to say, universities and schools of all kinds, including those establishments in which Catholic theology was taught. We must not, therefore, be surprised if, amongst the 1600 Belgian notables, 126 were found who guessed that, by the aid of these articles, and with a majority almost certain in the legislature, the sovereign would find it easy, when there arose any inducement to oppress the Catholics—that is to say, the inhabitants of Belgium—to attack them in the most inalienable of their rights, and what they held most dear—their liberty of conscience. Their fear, which the event has fully justified, was shared by all the Belgian clergy. And while we must regret that the protest made by the Bishop of Ghent at that period was so far influenced by the prejudices which were then entertained by some of our continental brethren, as even to anathematize the liberty of the press, we nevertheless cannot refrain from admiring, in all other respects, the foresight of that venerable prelate.

His courage cost him dear! Cited before the tribunals, and condemned to a disgraceful punishment as a common felon, he saved himself by flight, and died in exile; while his grand-vicars expiated in prison their attachment to their pastor. There was the greater imprudence in such hostile measures as these, because the Belgian Catholic clergy, even if they did not as yet quite understand the theory of civil liberty, had nevertheless always shewn themselves to be its vigilant and uncompromising defenders. Never, during the struggles between the municipalities of Brabant and Flanders, and their ancient dukes and counts, had they separated their cause from that of the people. And at a more recent period, when, in 1789, Joseph the Second had violently infringed upon the constitutional rights of Belgium, the priests had proved that their patriotism was as ardent as their faith was sincere. They consequently possessed the love and confidence of their fellow-citizens; and the government could not persecute them without exciting public indignation. No doubt modern infidelity had a certain number of proselytes amongst the upper classes of society, medical men especially, and barristers, who,

having borrowed their ideas of liberty from the French liberals, believed, perhaps sincerely, that a necessary condition for obtaining it was to persecute the Catholics. But they were not numerous in Belgium; and if the praise which they bestowed at first so prodigally upon King William, was repeated in every European journal; and if he thus obtained great popularity amongst the enemies of the Catholic Church, their temporary applause was dearly purchased by alienating the affections of incomparably the greater portion of his new subjects. They were disposed to be faithful to him, even if they could not love him, and certainly, if he had respected their religious scruples, all his other faults would not have deprived the head of the house of Orange of the brightest jewel of his crown. But it is not difficult to account for the mistake he fell into. In 1815, no one on the continent believed that the Catholic faith retained enough of vital energy to find defenders, and to have still some weight in the political destinies of nations; he therefore concluded that he should find but a feeble resistance from the Catholics to his favourite project, which was to render the union between the two countries indissoluble, by forcing upon Belgium the manners, the religion, and the language of Holland. He would then have found equal devotedness in all who were subject to his government; they would have been equally ready to defend him and his posterity from the ambitious tendencies of France, a neighbour the more to be dreaded, on account of the sincere Catholicity of the elder branch of the Bourbons. We acknowledge that the plan must have been very tempting to William, situated as he was, and being as he was, a Protestant and a Dutchman; and yet, in attempting to realize it, he succeeded in disgusting the whole body of the Belgians, whether Catholic or infidel, and in forcing them to form, in 1828, the powerful alliance which, two years later, expelled him from Brussels. We will pass over all grievances of lesser importance; we will not dwell upon his applying to Belgium a decree by which, on the 6th of November, 1814, while still Prince of Orange, he had abolished in Holland trial by jury, and in criminal matters the public examination of the accused and the witnesses. We will pass over the partiality shewn in the appointment of public functionaries; although, in the army for instance, while nearly two-thirds of the private soldiers were supplied by Belgium, three-fourths of the officers, according to the Baron de Reverberg—five-sixths, according to M. Nothomb—were Dutch. We will not expatiate upon a system of taxation evidently calculated so as to press most heavily, and most unfairly, upon the southern provinces. The partiality shewn to Holland would certainly, in the long run, have produced

more than one convulsion ; but the true cause of the Belgian revolution is to be found in the attempts made to change the religion and language of the inhabitants. We will, therefore, confine ourselves to a rapid sketch of such of the king's actions as tended to this point.

We will not charge against this prince the premiums he bestowed upon apostasy ;—being king, he might dispose of his favours as he pleased, and if the destinies of our Church, in any country whatever, depended upon such things as these, we should have less faith than we have in her immortality. But his interference in the education of youth was far more serious ; for the rising generation, if brought up under instructors of his selection, in a profound contempt of the religion of their fathers, could scarcely fail of being perverted. None could escape him ; for at the same time that he founded the three universities of Louvain, Ghent, and Liege, and gave to them alone the right to confer the degrees necessary for the exercise of any learned profession,—he took possession of the grammar and Latin schools, and placed in every parish a master for poor children ; so that, from the teaching of the alphabet, to that of the highest sciences, the same spirit of hatred to Catholicism prevailed throughout. The Catholics would have cared less for this, if, besides the government schools, there had been others conducted by men of incontestable sincerity in the profession of their own faith ; they would then have had a power of choice, and if, as tax-payers, they had complained of government money being wasted upon institutions that were useless to the great majority of the people, still, as fathers of families, they would not have had to dread the future apostacy of their children. But this apostacy was precisely William's object. And after severely prohibiting all schools not specially authorized by himself, he exercised a real inquisition in every family, as if he feared that a single child might escape his fatal influence. Thus, for instance, the clergy had retained the privilege of keeping, under the name of “ little seminaries,” establishments, in which children, destined by their parents for the priesthood, might receive an education. To these many parents sent their children, not that they might become priests, but in order to withdraw them from the teaching—always anti-Catholic, often anti-Christian—of the masters named by government. The *letter* was not broken of the tyrannical law that oppressed the Catholics ; for no one could prove that these children were *not* meant to take holy orders. But these “ little seminaries” began to multiply, and the Belgian youth, availing themselves of the opening, were about to escape from the royal apostle of Dutch Calvinism ; he perceived it, and sup-

pressed these schools, by a decree dated 14th June, 1825; and at the same time, fearing that many Catholic families might send their children to countries where there were Catholic schools, he declared, by a decree bearing the same date, that all young men who had not been educated in the kingdom, should be incapable of receiving diplomas or university degrees. Or, in other words, as these diplomas were required from all lawyers, doctors, and public functionaries, he made an anti-Catholic education a *sine qua non* for the practice of all learned professions, and for the holding of every public office of any value. Moreover, on the same day—a day fatal to the dynasty of Nassau—he issued a third decree, creating the philosophic College of Louvain,—the object of which was neither more nor less than to give Protestants or infidels to the Catholics for their bishops and clergy. According to the terms of this decree, no one could be admitted into the “greater seminaries” where theology was taught under the direction of the bishops, until he had passed at least two years in the philosophic college; and philosophy, with the sciences that result from it, could no longer be taught in the greater seminaries. The result would have been, that, during two years, the aspirants for holy orders must have followed the courses of the professors of the Louvain University, who were, for the most part, Protestants or infidels, mixing, at the same time, with the lay pupils of this university, without having been subjected to the serious and austere discipline required for the duties of the holy ministry. They would thus have reached the “greater seminaries” with morals corrupted by the contagion of bad example, and minds vitiated by the sophistry of masters chosen and paid expressly for the purpose of undermining their faith. Never since the days of Julian the Apostate had a more artful persecution been directed against the Church. William allowed the adult generation to continue Catholic; but his measures were so taken, that it was next to impossible for the rising generation to escape the snares he had laid for them. The Belgian Catholics comprehended the danger that threatened them. The bishops closed their seminaries, and the most violent opposition began; but it might have required years to ripen it into danger, had not William at the same time alienated the Belgian disciples of Voltaire, who were far less patient than their Christian fellow-countrymen, and, moreover, knew by long experience how thrones may be overturned. Irritated by different grievances, they ended by making common cause, and the watchword and object of their efforts was liberty of conscience. The Liberals brought to the struggle their tactics and their discipline, the Catholics their numbers—and revolution became inevitable. The Belgian Liberals had,

as we have stated, applauded the first acts of royal intolerance; and if William had done no more than oppress the Catholics, they would have continued his most devoted partizans. But the greater part of them, who were lawyers, men of letters, and the public functionaries of Napoleon's time, expected to have their full share in those good things which every government has to bestow. These good things were almost entirely reserved for Dutchmen, and this partiality was a sort of *intolerance* which *their* consciences could not bear, however quietly they had borne the persecution of their Catholic fellow-subjects. Already irritated by this unequal distribution of court favours, they were finally exasperated by the measures taken to substitute the use of the Dutch for that of the French language. The former had been declared by the constitution to be the national language; and the king, keeping constantly in view his plan for blending the two nations into an indissoluble union, had begun, from the very first days of his reign, to encourage, by every means possible, the use and study of the Dutch language. But the Belgians did not know this language; the lower orders spoke Flemish in the western provinces, a sort of bad French in those to the east, and German in the Duchy of Luxembourg; the well-educated classes universally spoke French; it was the language of the bar, and it was that used by the Belgian deputies in the legislature; therefore, to prohibit the public use of any but the Dutch language, was, in fact, to exclude the Belgians from the bar, from the senate, and from all public offices whatever. But William did not shrink from the dissatisfaction that such a measure must create amongst his few remaining adherents in the country. On the 26th October, 1822, while tolerating the use of the German language in Luxembourg, and of French in the Walloon districts, he totally interdicted it in the Flemish provinces, and particularly at Brussels. A few aged lawyers, indeed, obtained permission to plead in the only tongue which they could speak; but this favour, which was refused to the younger, more active, and more influential members of the profession in the capital, had little effect in appeasing the general outcry. A more energetic party now joined in the measured opposition of the Catholics, and dragged to light and examined with vindictive avidity all the grievances of Belgium. The press was not inactive, in spite of the Draconian laws that fettered it. Without the concurrence of the legislature, on the 20th August, 1815, William had issued a decree "against all who should circulate reports calculated to alarm or trouble the public mind; against all who should prove themselves to be the partizans or instruments of any foreign power, either by public speeches or clamour, or by

any acts or writings; and, finally, against all who should seek to foment quarrels, distrust, or disunion amongst the people; or to excite them to disorder or to sedition." These regulations were construed to be applicable to the press, and the penalties inflicted upon delinquents, were, in Holland, whipping, branding with a red-hot iron, and imprisonment, which might be prolonged for ten years. In Belgium, the government substituted fining for the whip, but the accused were to be tried by eight councillors *named by the king*.

These punishments, worthy of Turkey, were in force until 1829, yet the opposition was not the less active. It was shown in the choice of the representatives of the southern provinces, who were almost, without an exception, hostile to the Dutch interests, and this, in spite of that article of the fundamental law, which, in regulating the right of suffrage, had refused it by implication to all public functionaries who had been dismissed by the ministry. This clause, which is unparalleled in representative governments, was another cause of irritation, exciting fresh tempests and allaying none. We have said, that the Belgian liberals had joined the Catholic party; the former desired a revolution,—the latter had, in the first instance, asked only for a withdrawal of the decrees against liberty of conscience; but they afterwards perceived that, as citizens, they had rights to defend which the monarch had trampled on,—and, in 1829, they demanded the enjoyment of their constitutional rights as urgently as the liberals themselves. But still their most influential members, and the clergy above all, had no intention of expelling King William. Unhappily for this prince, when at length he became so alarmed by the union of parties against him, as to revoke the greater part of the obnoxious decrees, which he did in 1829, the concession inspired no confidence. The people were convinced that he would, on the first opportunity, return with renewed severity to the measures he had been forced to abandon for a time. Such an opportunity was denied to him by Providence. The revolution of July occasioned the revolution of September. Brussels followed the example of Paris; and the Belgian Catholics, with more repugnance than is generally believed, found themselves drawn on by their liberal fellow-countrymen, by whom the signal of revolt was given, as is well known to all who are versed in the history of the events of that period. Not that they did not abhor the tyranny of the king, but that an armed resistance was repugnant to their religious principles, especially while there was any hope left of obtaining legal redress without bloodshed. They had agitated with a safe conscience,

and never intended going farther, until compelled, by what to them was an "untoward event." But they could not forsake those who had so far made common cause with them:—to do so would have been an act both of meanness and of extreme imprudence. For King William, after subduing (as he might then have done with ease) the Brussels insurgents, would have found an easy opportunity and a plausible pretext for oppressing the Catholics more heavily than ever. To escape then from this worse than Egyptian bondage, they took up arms in every part of the country; and the Dutch army, beaten by the people at every point, was forced to fall back into Holland. In the southern provinces, they could retain only Maestricht, Antwerp, and a few fortifications near the mouth of the Scheld. In fact, they were struck with universal and panic terror, although the insurgents had no soldiers to oppose to them, but half-armed undisciplined militia without artillery. If the next year, when the Dutch army was more numerous and better generalled, it obtained a victory at Louvain over the same men that had conquered them while dispersed over the Belgian territory, there is no great cause for boasting in such a victory, gained as it was over unpractised recruits, without generals or plans, and taken by surprise. At any rate, the Belgians may set off against their disasters in 1831, the defeat of Frederic Prince of Orange before the walls of Brussels. But Belgium has a far more real and exalted title to glory, in the way she extricated herself from an unforeseen revolution, that had left her without a government, without an army, without finances;—no disorder took place throughout the country; or, at any rate, the exasperation of the populace stopped of its own accord, almost immediately, and unchecked by any external force; and the provisional government that had been formed in the midst of the disturbance, hastened to convoke a congress, which was a genuine representation of the country. In it the Catholic members formed an immense majority, and the constitution which now governs the country was chiefly their work. We are proud of this fact, because that constitution is beyond comparison the most liberal upon the Continent; and in both the chambers which it instituted, the Catholic members have, up to the present moment, watched vigilantly over its faithful execution. Liberty of conscience, freedom of the press and of instruction, trial by jury, a suffrage we may call almost universal, and the ballot;—these are the great benefits secured to the Belgians, by a charter which might serve as a model to all people wishing for useful and permanent reforms. And it is not only as a theory, as a speculation, that it deserves our approbation,—it has worked well; and that argu-

ment, which justified in the eyes of the Tories even the rotten boroughs, may, with at least equal justice, be alleged in behalf of the Belgian constitution. The 10,000 Protestants who live under it, enjoy the same rights as their Catholic fellow-countrymen, although those amount to 4,000,000. With equal freedom they may establish schools, publish what they please, vote at elections, and fill public offices, without having to dread the interference of government upon any point whatever. And the public expenditure is regulated with the strictest economy. In 1830, after fifteen years of peace, the Budget for the kingdom of the Low Countries amounted to 77,800,000 florins, or 168,000,000 of francs. In 1838, the Belgian Budget is not higher than 90,000,000 francs, although she has had to maintain an army, (now perfectly well equipped and disciplined), of 107,000 men; and she has appropriated very considerable sums to the construction of rail-ways. Thus, under this free, economical, and improving government, in spite of the embarrassments of a revolution, and the exorbitant expense of an army out of proportion with the population; notwithstanding, too, the loss of the trade to the Dutch colonies, her internal prosperity has increased in an unexampled manner. No traveller passing through Belgium can avoid being struck with the great activity of the country; the number of new houses in the towns, the manufactories rising on all sides, and the construction of new roads and canals. Jointstock companies, having amongst them a capital of more than 16,000,000 sterling, have been formed for the purpose of giving an impulse to commerce and industry; and the long neglected province of Luxembourg has not been forgotten in the distribution of this enormous sum. Antwerp, whose ruin was foretold as the necessary consequence of the revolution, had received into her ports in 1829, (her most prosperous year under the Dutch management) only 1,031 vessels, carrying 138,945 tons. In 1837, the number has risen to 1,426 vessels, bearing 225,259 tons. In fact, the value of property generally has risen at least forty per cent., and more than one hundred and eighty miles of rail-way are already open for general circulation. The moral improvement of the people has kept pace with this progress. The country receives all the benefit of an active competition between four universities, of which two are independent of government, being supported by voluntary contributions, while, on the other hand, the instruction of the people is carried on, on the most extensive scale. Besides the Sunday schools which have been established since the revolution of September in every petty village, the primary schools, maintained by government, or by private charity, had admitted in 1836, 421,808

children ; the same schools in 1826, only containing 307,584 children. The friends of real liberty may therefore produce Belgium with triumph to the partizans of absolutism. The more free she is, and the more happy, the more must the European despots dread and detest the contagion of her example. That they should seek to destroy the happiness she enjoys, and which is a practical argument against the power they are abusing, we can easily understand ; but that England and France, who may perhaps, before long, require the concurrence of every heart that palpitates with the love of reasonable liberty, that *they* should give her up a prey to unjust oppression,—this we cannot believe. It would, on their part, be the most grievous of mistakes. If Belgium had had a population of 20,000,000 inhabitants, she needed not have been anxious, after breaking the yoke of Holland, to obtain the consent of the other European powers ; but she cannot acquire the independence that results from power, and, consequently, her existence was, and is still, at the mercy of diplomacy. She might perhaps in 1830, while the revolutionary spirit that overthrew the dynasty of Charles X was besieging every throne upon the Continent, have declared herself a republic, and given the signal for a general war of the people against kings. The monarchs of Europe feared this ; and Louis Philippe more than any of them ; for his royalty, though sprung from a revolution, would probably have been the first to perish in any great uprising of the democracy. They endeavoured, therefore, to arrest the movement for which Belgium had given the signal, in Belgium itself ; and they succeeded easily ; for the Belgians, or at any rate the Catholic majority of them, had a horror of the crimes by which revolutions on the Continent have been usually attended ; and they were really anxious for two things only,—their national independence, and their civil and religious liberty. The foreign powers allowed them to secure this liberty, by erecting a constitution for themselves, and promised them their independence, giving as a pledge for it the immediate recognition of England and France. But two questions arose, the settlement of which was most important for Europe and for Belgium herself. The first was the choice of the new sovereign ; the second the conditions upon which Belgium should be separated from Holland, including all the difficulties of a territorial division, and the distribution of the debt of the Low Countries,—conditions to which William was to be a consenting party. France and England found no difficulty in persuading the Belgians to adopt a monarchical form of government, and after some hesitation as to the Duke de Leuchtenberg and the Duke de Nemours, they ended by fixing their choice upon Prince Leopold, certain that

they thereby secured for themselves the support of England whenever they had justice on their side. It had not been forgotten, that he had displayed great firmness and sagacity on a former occasion, when an attempt was made to *kidnap* him into Greece. He acted with the same caution on this solemn occasion; and he did not consent to become king till he had taken all the precautions that human prudence could dictate, at a moment when even the Russian ambassador was constantly repeating to him that the peace of Europe depended upon his immediate acceptance of the crown. The plenipotentiaries of all the great powers had been for months assembled in London; they had laid it down as a principle, that for the sake of the interests of the whole of Europe, they ought to take upon themselves the arrangement of all the existing difficulties between Belgium and Holland; already a multitude of protocols had been sent forth, and had, so early as January 1831, established the bases of the separation between the two countries,—which bases were accepted on the 18th February by King William, but rejected by the Belgian congress, because the Duchy of Luxembourg was not comprised within the boundaries of Belgium; at length, after six months' negotiation, on the 26th June 1831, they proposed, or rather dictated, as preliminaries to a treaty of peace, eighteen articles, of which we subjoin the most important:—

“Article 1st. The limits of Holland shall comprehend all the territories, fortifications, towns, and places, which belonged to the former republic of the United Provinces of the Low Countries in the year 1790.

“Article 2nd. Belgium shall be composed of all the remaining territories that received the name of Kingdom of the Low Countries in 1815.

“Article 3rd. The five powers will employ their good offices for preserving the *statu quo* in the Grand Duchy of Luxembourg during the course of a separate negotiation, which the sovereign of Belgium will open with the King of the Low Countries, and with the Germanic confederation on the subject of the said Grand Duchy, which negotiation shall be distinct from the question concerning the limits between Belgium and Holland. It is understood that the fortress of Luxembourg shall preserve its free communication with Germany.

“Article 4th. If it shall be proved that the republic of the United Provinces of the Low Countries did not exercise exclusive sovereignty in the Town of Maestricht in 1790, the two parties must consider of some means of coming to a suitable arrangement upon this point.

“Article 5th. As it would result from the bases laid down in Articles 1 and 2 that Holland and Belgium would possess mutual checks upon their respective territories, they shall agree in an amicable spirit upon such exchanges as shall mutually be judged convenient.

“Article 6th. The reciprocal evacuation of territories, towns, and

fortresses, shall take place independently of any arrangement as to exchanges.

“Article 9th. Belgium, within the limits which will be traced in conformity to the principles laid down in these preliminaries, shall form a perpetually neutral state. The five powers, without wishing to interfere in her internal regulations, secure to her this perpetual neutrality, and also the integrity and inviolability of her territory, within the limits mentioned in the present article.

“Article 10th. By a just reciprocity Belgium shall be required to observe on her part the same neutrality towards all other states, not endangering their external or internal tranquillity, but retaining the right to defend herself against all foreign aggression.

“Article 12th. The debt shall be divided so as to make each party resume its original share of the debt contracted before the union, and to divide in just proportion that which they mutually incurred while their interests were in common.

“Article 13. Commissioners of liquidation to be named by each party shall meet immediately. Their first object shall be to fix the quotional part that Belgium will have to pay provisionally, and, (until liquidation) of the interest of the debts mentioned in the preceding Article.”*

Thus Luxembourg was provisionally preserved to Belgium; she obtained from the conference whatever she could reasonably ask for; and she obtained it because the plenipotentiaries knew that Prince Leopold would not accept a crown that had been rendered unpopular by a dismemberment of the national territory. This fact is confirmed by the protocol No. 24, which is thus expressed:—

“Considering that it appears from the statement made by Lord Ponsonby, 1st, that the adhesion of the Belgian congress to the bases of the separation of Belgium from Holland would be greatly facilitated if the five powers would consent to support Belgium in her desire to obtain by onerous title (*à titre onereux*) the acquisition of the Grand Duchy of Luxembourg; 2nd, that the choice of a sovereign having become indispensable, as a preliminary to definitive arrangements, the best means of attaining the object in view will be to remove all difficulties that might interfere with the Prince Leopold of Saxe Cobourg's accepting the crown of Belgium, if it should be offered to him, as there seems every reason to believe it will.”

Was the conference sincere in holding this language? Yes. For at the date of this protocol Poland was not yet conquered—Italy was on the point of revolting against Austria—Germany was violently agitated by the spirit of the age—and the French republicans were not yet completely subdued. To give a king to Belgium was therefore to extinguish one of the craters of this

* “Et sauf liquidation pour le service d'un portion des intérêts des dettes mentionnés dans l'article précédent.”

democratic volcano; and the great powers were too much interested in effecting this to be niggards in their promises. So little were they sparing of them to Prince Leopold, that when on the 18th of June 1831, he expressed to the members of the conference a fear that he would not be recognized as king by their respective sovereigns, if the King of Holland should not accept the eighteen Articles, the Count Matuzewits, the Russian ambassador, declared that the King of Holland should be compelled, whether he would or not, to acknowledge the new king of the Belgians.* These eighteen Articles, therefore, were the condition that Leopold made with the conference for accepting the throne. And if the honour of modern kings was like that of other mortals, no doubt they were pledged to him to carry the treaty of the 26th of June into literal execution. But it would appear that the word of a sovereign is more elastic; for the Emperor of Russia hastened to declare that he would adhere to the treaty only so far as it was ratified by the King of Holland. It must be observed that Leopold was now in Brussels, and that Warsaw had fallen into the power of the autocrat.

But the labours of the conference had not been fruitless. The Dutch plenipotentiaries had admitted the principle of a separation between the countries; they had admitted also that Belgium and Holland ought each to bear the debt they had severally contracted before the union; and to divide that which had been incurred since that period. The only question, then, which seemed to offer any difficulty, was that of territory, which might have been easily settled had good sense been consulted. Why, in fact, did the conference, why did William himself, consent to allow the independence of Brabant and the two Flanders? Evidently because Brabant and the two Flanders had conquered and proclaimed their independence. Either then the new state of Belgium should not have existed at all, or it should have comprehended all that part of the kingdom of the Low Countries which had withdrawn itself from the dominion of Holland; and in the last alternative it was for the inhabitants themselves to decide which sovereign should rule over them. But this would have been to acknowledge fully the right of the people to shake off a yoke of tyranny, and it was precisely to avoid leading to such a consequence that protocols were so numerous. Instead of admitting the broad principle we have laid down, the plenipotentiaries, at those moments when they were most favourably inclined to Belgium, proposed the *uti possidetis* of 1790 for the two countries, and would not decide at once the fate of the

* Whyte's "Belgio Revolution," vol. ii. p. 334.

Duchy of Luxembourg; upon the specious pretext that this Duchy depended upon the Germanic confederation.

From time immemorial, under the Spanish and Austrian dominion, this province, a wreck, it is true, of the Holy Roman, or rather German empire, had made part of Belgium. More recently, in 1815, the constitution of the Low Countries had explicitly placed it amongst the southern or Belgian provinces; and more conclusive still, the representatives of Luxembourg, elected before the revolution of Brussels, having presented themselves at the Hague to sit with the States General of Holland, were excluded from the Assembly, as not forming part of Holland. The King of Holland then, or rather Holland itself, had no interest in the question.

The Germanic confederation must, one would think, be indifferent upon the subject, since it cannot be of any importance to them whether William or Leopold is Grand Duke of Luxembourg,—provided, which is contested by no party, that the formidable fortress of Luxembourg remains in their power. This debate was then personal on William's side, yet it has apparently been the chief obstacle to the conclusion of any arrangement. Unhappily for Belgium she had blindly confided in the promises and the power of European diplomacy, persuaded that any aggression on the part of Holland was impossible. She had laboured but carelessly in the formation of an army, and had placed inexperienced officers at the head of her young soldiers, organizing nothing, not even a staff, or a commissariat; while King William reorganized the remains of the force that was scattered and beaten in 1830.

Ten months had, in this respect, entirely changed the situation of the two countries, and even of all Europe; the democratic power having received more than one check. William profited by these circumstances to disturb the festivities which popular enthusiasm was giving to the new King of Belgium, by an invasion that took them totally by surprise; and the more naturally, because in Nov. 1830 the conference had ordered a suspension of all hostilities between the two countries. Both parties had acquiesced in this suspension, and King William had not announced his intention to resume hostilities either to the conference or to Belgium.

Accordingly the Belgians were easily dispersed, and but for the presence of a French army, in August 1831, their principal towns must have fallen into the power of the enemy. But still, if they had been left to themselves, they would, though perhaps after much suffering, have expelled the invaders, when their forces were scattered, as they must afterwards have been; and

when they found themselves, like the French in Spain, masters of nothing more than the ground under military occupation.

The conference, which ought and was bound in honour to cause the execution of the eighteen Articles—the conference so obviously insulted by Holland—resumed its labours, and chose to consider the eighteen Articles as being no longer in existence. The moral strength of Belgium was destroyed, and the feeling was to reward King William for the victory he had gained over democracy. We will not follow these negotiations into the labyrinth in which they entangled themselves, although the excellent work of M. Nothomb (now Minister of Public Works in Belgium) throws a strong light upon this part of contemporary history. It appears from his book that the plenipotentiaries of the great powers, unanimous in their determination not to bring about a general war on account of Belgium, were divided upon every other point; Russia, Prussia, and Austria, wishing, since they could not hinder the independent existence of Belgium, to prevent its being glorious, or of long continuance. Thenceforward the balance leaned towards Holland, and in spite of the efforts of the Belgian Envoys, a definitive arrangement was proposed by the conference on the 15th of October, and accepted on the 15th of the following November by the King of the Belgians. This treaty, which is known by the name of the twenty-four Articles, adjudges to the King of Holland a part of Luxembourg; and, as an indemnity for that part of it which was to be preserved to Belgium, a considerable portion of Limbourg also; so that Holland, possessed of Maestricht, would become mistress of the Meuse, as far as to its junction with the Rhine. It was stipulated besides, that in the division of the debt of the old kingdom of the Low Countries, Belgium should take such a capital as would bear an annual interest of 8,400,000 florins, and that she should be accountable to Holland for the arrears then due from the 1st of January, 1830. These are the principal points in the treaty, which excited at the time the strongest discontent among the Belgians, and which they never would have accepted, but for the Dutch invasion, and its disastrous consequences upon their fortunes. But at any rate, until the King of Holland had *accepted* this treaty, the Belgians were not bound by it, except to the conference; and for the misfortune of the people whom he governs (whatever may happen henceforward) he would not acquiesce in these conditions, the most favourable he could have hoped for, until a period of eight years had elapsed, and he had exhausted all his financial resources.

During these eight years, each country has undergone a revolution of an opposite tendency from that of the year 1831.

The citadel of Antwerp has been besieged by a French army, and restored to its lawful owners. Belgium has had time to raise an army as well disciplined as it is brave, and completely organized: its finances are in the most flourishing condition; and its king unquestionably the most popular monarch upon the continent. Holland on the contrary has increased her debt and taxes to so alarming a degree, that were things to continue in their present state, her credit must fail; great discontent has been made manifest even in the States-General, and the old republican feelings are daily gaining strength; and the people care little for an augmentation of territory, which will not diminish the burdens that oppress them. There is, therefore, so great a difference between 1831 and 1838, that Belgium, which had contracted no engagement to Holland by the twenty-four Articles, and was bound only to the conference, has a perfect right to demand from it some modification of a treaty which is so disadvantageous to her. She has a right to claim this on another account, for it was an express stipulation in the treaty of the twenty-four Articles, that it should be *executed immediately*. In obedience to this clause the King of the Belgians addressed himself officially to the conference, and on the 22nd of October 1832, France and England agreed to compel the King of Holland to evacuate the fortified towns which he still held in Belgium. This agreement was followed up—our fleet blockaded the coast of Holland, and the citadel of Antwerp was besieged by the French army. If therefore the treaty of 1831 was not executed at the time, it was evidently not the fault of Belgium; and, consequently, she ought to be fully indemnified for the losses she has sustained, and the expenses she has been put to, during these last eight years. If Holland has also suffered, she owes it to herself alone, or rather to the obstinacy of her king—the harm she has done herself should not be allowed to compensate for that she has occasioned; and the conference, which has constituted itself supreme arbitrator between the two states, is bound in justice to make amends to Belgium at the expense of Holland; or, in other words, to revise the twenty-four Articles, so as to render them less obnoxious to the injured party.

A pecuniary compensation seems that which would be most suitable, considering the nature of the damage incurred; and if suitably awarded, would certainly greatly surpass in amount the arrears of that part of the debt required from Belgium. But from the ruinous state of her finances Holland would suffer much more from this method of compensation than Belgium would gain; while, on the other hand, the latter has much more need to secure the integrity of her territory, than she has for an abate-

ment of taxation. The interest of the two countries should be taken into consideration in the adjustment of their differences, and a glance at the map is sufficient to show that the revenue of Holland would profit little by such an enlargement of her frontier as the twenty-four Articles would give her. It can be of little importance to Holland that her sovereign should reign over a new Duchy of Luxembourg, composed of two fragments, the one taken from the old duchy, the other taken from the province of Limbourg, and separated from each other by the Belgic province of Liege, if the revenues of the territory, thus obtained, are scarcely sufficient to pay the expenses of its own government. No doubt, if it was her object to find pretexts for a war hereafter with her neighbour, she might, nay she must, attach great value to an acquisition, which implies the necessity for a military passage through Belgium, with all the consequent risk of collision between the foreign soldiers and the inhabitants; but if King William indulges in these hopes, they are certainly not entertained by the calculating people whom he governs. They know that the net revenue of the whole of the district, ceded to them by the twenty-four Articles, is not more than £400,000, and that, therefore, the taxes would scarcely meet the expenses of administration, even if a military occupation, at least for some years, should not prove necessary: they know also the bold and active character of the people, and their antipathy to Holland; they know that the possession of Maestricht, with a military line, is sufficient for their security; and as the thing which they most desire is the reduction of their army to a peace establishment, they will on all these accounts be little solicitous for the expensive advantages which the treaty of the 15th of November has stipulated in their favour. The case would certainly be altered, if, instead of the woods and ravines of Luxembourg, Antwerp and the marshes of the Scheld had been conceded to them; for they would then, as formerly, have increased the trade of Rotterdam and Amsterdam, by closing this fine port against our vessels; but the districts which it is proposed to give up to them, would be only a heavy burden upon their budget; and the loss they would sustain by keeping them is so obvious, that we can only understand the obstinacy of King William upon this point, by attributing to him, as well as to the three absolute powers who support his claims, ulterior views of a nature hostile to the peace of the world, and above all to the security of France.

If then the treaty of the 15th of November is to be considered as definitive, it is evident that a territorial compensation would be much more for the interest of Holland than a pecuniary one, which she could ill afford. The situation of the two countries

points out the nature of the alteration which should be made in the treaty, better than the treaty itself can do ; for the fifteenth Article, which determines the division of the debt of the kingdom of the Low Countries, is, above all others, opposed to every rule of equity.

We almost regret that we should be obliged to expose all that was iniquitous in the administration of finances under William ; but this last grievance of Belgium cannot be done justice to without throwing obloquy upon this prince, and it is painful to see the majesty of the throne degraded by such unworthy actions. The Russian Autocrat, with his proscriptions, is doubtless more detestable than William of Nassau and his *syndicate*, but he does not inspire us with the same disgust. The work of M. Ansiane, and that of M. Dumortier, which is in all respects worthy of attention, throw strong light upon the financial history of the Low Countries, and the more convincingly, as every fact affirmed is supported by the testimony of official documents ; and we do not hesitate to say, that never in the most despotic government was the royal authority used to cover more fraudulent manœuvres ; we are really embarrassed by the number we have to choose from. Thus, on the 20th of June 1814, it was decided by the allied sovereigns, that Belgium should contribute to the payment of the old Dutch debt ; and to the great advantage of the speculators, who were initiated into the secret, this determination, which so greatly enhanced the value of the debt, was not published till July 1815. Again, a secret article of the treaty concluded at Vienna, the 31st of May 1815, had charged to the account of Belgium a loan contracted by Austria, during her last wars with Turkey, although Austria, by the 8th Article of the treaty of Lunenville, did in 1801 acknowledge that debt as her own ; and it was not until 1816 that, by a simple act of his council, unauthorized by the legislature, William made this stipulation public, thereby giving to this loan, the interest of which had not been paid for thirty years, a value which suddenly enriched all those who were enabled to profit by this suspicious silence. Thus again, the constitution having given its sanction to the investment of a part of the civil list in public domains, on the 26th of August 1822, the ministry proposed a law, by which, without any valuation, or any security as to their real value, beyond that of mere assertion, public domains, of which part were situated in the northern, and part in the southern provinces, were adjudged to the sovereign, in place of a net revenue of 500,000 florins.

The Belgian portion of these public lands turned out to be of so much greater value than had been supposed, that, before the

law had passed, a company offered for the forests only which it comprised, the price of 20,000,000 florins: but the offer was rejected, and William, by his own authority, established a bank at Brussels, which he called *A Society for favouring Industry*, to which he sold the domains that had been ceded to him for 40,000 shares of 500 florins each; he thus became the principal capitalist of his kingdom, and acquired the complete dominion of the money market, for the bank, of which he was the principal shareholder, was quite under his dominion. He empowered it to receive the public money, and out of its directing members selected the body of the *syndicate*, which we are about to mention; and by the help of these two instruments he succeeded in emancipating himself from all control, and in prodigiously increasing his personal fortune.

On this occasion, as well as on all those where the liberty or the fortunes of the citizens were concerned, the measures proposed by his ministers were carried only by a majority of two or three votes,—all the Belgian deputies, excepting this small number of apostates, voting against them. But all the Dutch members voted for them, their consciences not suffering from the measures of hostility to the Belgians, nor yet their national interests, for it was always the tendency of the new laws to transform the old Dutch debt for ever, even in the event of a separation, into a debt common to Belgium and Holland.

It was not till 1822 that the financial plans of King William became fully manifest. Until then the commissioners of the sinking fund, and the board which, under the name of *Syndicate of the Low Countries*, had been invested with the power of issuing exchequer bills, or rather bonds, to the amount of 85,000,000 of florins, had annually laid their accounts before the chambers, agreeably to the 107th Article of the constitution. This was too powerful a check not to be removed; and a law passed on the 27th of December, empowered the king to appoint a new *syndicate*, which was to be invested with the management of the sinking fund, the administration of the public domains, the superintendence of all public improvements, the payment of all pensions due by the state, and the raising of new loans. To this board were transferred all the papers, bonds, vouchers, funds, &c., belonging to the former *syndicate* and sinking fund, unaccompanied with any report laid before the chambers, specifying the value of the property, or the nature of the documents thus given up. However much the reader may be surprised at this fact, his astonishment will cease when he learns that by the same law the new *syndicate* was to lay open its accounts only to the king, and to a commission composed of the presidents of the two chambers,

(whose nomination depended on the royal will), and five functionaries, removable at pleasure. Moreover, these seven personages were bound by the law itself to observe an inviolable secrecy upon all facts communicated to them. Thus an impenetrable mystery was thrown over the whole financial system of the Low Countries: the king alone, and his agents, knew what was going on, and they strove by all means in their power to deepen the obscurity which was so favourable to stock-jobbing pursuits. On the one hand, the chambers could no longer verify the receipts, since the receivers-general, formerly established in every province, had been supplanted by William's bank; on the other, they were by law kept in ignorance of the new loans that were raised, and of the administration of the public debt. Never, certainly, were the finances of any country so completely in the power of the sovereign; and we must not forget that the Dutch deputies would never have submitted to this system if they had not known that Belgium alone would suffer by it.

The deferred Dutch debt, and the deferred Austro-Belgic debt, the last comprehending the two-thirds of the original debt, and amounting to 32,288,824 florins, were to be transferred by lot to the active debt, until it should equal the amount of the active debt annually redeemed out of the sinking fund, and the *syndicate* took upon itself to hasten the transfer, by buying up the securities of the holders. We leave the reader to guess how such an operation was conducted, of which up to this day no definitive account has been rendered to the public. The exchequer bonds issued by the former *syndicate* were payable in series from year to year; the new *syndicate* was authorised to pay them by new bonds—large sums were required for the exigencies of the Dutch colonies, and the King, without the concurrence of the chambers, authorized the *syndicate* to lend to these colonies as much as 80,000,000 of florins. Besides this, the *syndicate* received the revenues of the public domains, the prices of those which they sold, and the tolls on the roads and canals; they paid the pensioners of state, the interest of the public debt, and all this without rendering any account, or having any one to overlook their proceedings but the king.

We are mistaking:—in 1829 ministers were constrained by public clamour a little to raise the veil that concealed this sanctuary of Royal stock-jobbing. But the figures set out proved little, except the extreme embarrassment of the sovereign in having to make them public at all. If they were of any use, it was to shew, that of the 68,000,000 of bonds, which the law of the 27th of December 1822 had allowed the *syndicate* to issue successively, in order to pay the state pensioners, the sum of

20,000,000 only had been issued up to that time. Since then and up to this day the same darkness hides the operations of this fatal institution. Is it necessary to give an explanation of this mystery in administering the money of a nation? Will it be believed that William had the courage to lay before the conference, in his statement of the public debt of the Low Countries, not only the entire amount of the 68,000,000 florins we have mentioned, although such of the pensioners of the state as were born in Belgium have been paid by their native country since 1830, but also a loan of 30,000,000 of florins, which the *syndicate* had been authorized to raise in March 1830, and which had not been realized when the revolution broke out?

In order to understand the financial position of the Low Countries, and to distinguish the debt existing before the union, from those contracted during its continuance, the conference had addressed eighteen questions to the ministers of Holland and Belgium. As Holland alone was in possession of the documents of the *syndicate*, she alone could reply: for sixty-five laws and ordinances, purposely drawn up in a confused and contradictory manner, were the only sources from whence the representatives of Belgium could obtain their information. Taking advantage of the faults of their masters, imitating the bankrupt who avails himself of the bad state of his books to deceive justice, the Dutch plenipotentiaries made the total of the sums borrowed since 1815 to amount to 307,806,803 florins (£25,650,567), to wit: 167,806,838 florins, at $2\frac{1}{2}$ per cent., 110,000,000 florins, bearing $4\frac{1}{2}$ per cent., and 30,000,000 florins bearing $3\frac{1}{2}$ per cent. interest. Supposing these statements to be correct, what must we think of a government which after fifteen years' peace, presents such a deficit? to which should be added public property which the *syndicate* sold, and of which the value was nearly 100,000,000 florins. But William is in this respect less guilty than he would wish to appear. We must deduct from this debt,—1st from the debt at $2\frac{1}{2}$ per cent. the 48,000,000, which in 1829 the *syndicate* had not expended; 2nd, from the debt at $4\frac{1}{2}$ per cent. the principal part of the capital employed in buying back the postponed debt—Dutch, and consequently not forming part of the debt common to both countries, but of that which belonged exclusively to Holland; 3d, 30,000,000 of florins lent by the *syndicate* to the Dutch colonies, which Holland has retained; and 4th, the loan at $3\frac{1}{2}$ per cent, which, as it was only authorized on the 27th of March 1830, had not been raised, or at least expended, at the time of the revolution of Brussels. As these loans were raised by the *syndicate* without publicity or competition, and almost always by issuing their own bonds, we acknowledge that it is

very difficult to make out exactly, from the documents annexed to the protocol No. 44, what debts were really contracted during the union. Happily we shall find a clue in the account submitted to the chambers, on the 15th of January, 1829, by the help of which we may extricate ourselves from the labyrinth. The minister then set out the following statement of the public debt :

	florins.	cents.
Ancient Dutch debt - - - - -	14,383,766	12
Austro-Belgic debt - - - - -	403,610	32
Old debt of southern provinces - - - - -	282,719	66
Arrears of Low Countries - - - - -	353,420	92
* Deficit for 1819 and previous years - - - - -	577,075	0
* Ditto 1820 - - - - -	194,700	0
* Ditto for previous years - - - - -	1,422,550	0
* Extinction of pensions - - - - -	1,682,300	0
* Dutch Dykes - - - - -	315,125	0
	<hr/>	
	19,615,267	02
Deduct the sums ordered to be cancelled by the law of the 24th of December, 1829 - - - - -	350,000	0
	<hr/>	
Remain - - - - -	19,267,266	02

The items marked with a * are those contracted during the Union. This document shews, that the debts contracted since the union of the two countries, produced together an interest of 4,191,760 florins; and that the debts which Belgium had contracted *before* 1814, even if the entire of the *arrears of the Low Countries* are charged to her, produced an interest of 1,039,750 florins. If, then, the principle adopted in the eighteen articles had been fully carried out in drawing up the treaty of the 15th November—if debts contracted before the Union and not yet defrayed had been charged to the account of the country contracting them—and the others divided in equal portions, Belgium would have had to pay in all an annual interest of 3,135,630 florins;—that is, 1,039,750 florins for her own debts, and 2,095,880 florins for her part of those of the kingdom of the Low Countries. But after the disastrous campaign of Louvain, the influence of constitutional governments had much declined in the conference. It was no longer Belgium which could give the signal for the general war that all alike feared; it was Holland:—and her plenipotentiaries profited by this to obtain the recognition of a new principle, namely, that of giving compensation to King William. They dared not say to Belgium, that her independence was sold to her, but, in fact, they did sell it to her when they accepted the accounts of Holland as she was pleased to present them. In its protocol of the 27th January, the con-

ference proposed to charge against Belgium, 1st, the Austro-Belgic debt; 2nd, all the ancient debts of the Belgic provinces; 3d, the debts which Holland contracted subsequently to the Union; and, 4th, the value of the sacrifices made by Holland to obtain that Union. The third class was applicable only to the Russian loan of 25,000,000 guaranteed by Holland in 1814, and of which the half had been charged to the account of the kingdom of the Low Countries, by the treaty of the 19th May, 1811; and as England by the convention concluded with Russia on the 16th November, 1831, had taken this debt upon herself, this clause was on the eve of losing its object. As for the fourth, it went to make Belgium pay the value of those colonies which had formerly belonged to Holland, and which she had given up to England, by the treaties that constituted the kingdom of the Low Countries. This was to assimilate Belgium to those colonies, and the Belgians to the negroes that cultivate them; and their plenipotentiaries protested so vehemently against such a degradation, that the conference was obliged to renounce this plan. But Belgium was to gain nothing by the concession, for, in the protocol of the 6th October, 1831, which precedes and explains the treaty of the twenty-four articles,—the conference, in the first place, valued the interest of the debt contracted by the kingdom of the Low Countries, at 10,500,000 florins, and charged the half of it, that is to say, an annual interest of 5,050,000 florins, to Belgium. 2ndly, it calculated the interest of the debts which were of Belgic origin, at 2,750,000; and, 3dly, it imposed upon Belgium an annual tribute to Holland of 600,000 florins, as a compensation for the commercial advantages granted by the latter. These advantages consisted, 1st, in the opening of the Scheld,—as if the treaties since 1790, had left to Holland any right to close this river; 2nd, a free passage to Germany by Limbourg, a road which is now rendered useless by the completion of the rail-way from Antwerp to Liège; and, 3d, the navigation of the waters between the Scheld and the Rhine. Happily the conference declares in the same protocol, that its decision is based upon the documents furnished by the Dutch plenipotentiaries, and it adds, that should these statements be proved incorrect, it would have a right to declare void the results of its calculations. This last declaration they revoked the following day, (7th October, 1831), but the conference is not the less pledged to its public statement, that the documents used were exclusively Dutch. If, therefore, there is an error in the calculations it has made, the most ordinary justice requires that it should be rectified. We can imagine, that the conference, tired of never-ending difficulties, which placed them in constant

risk of a general war, should have desired Belgium and Holland to have the accounts of the mysterious syndicate investigated by their own arbitrators, and that they may have thought that the errors which they must have suspected, would then be corrected for the advantage of Belgium. Neither are we surprised, that Belgium herself, in her then deplorable situation, should have accepted any terms that were imposed upon her. But as King William, instead of ratifying the treaty of the 15th November, in the two following months, as was stipulated by the treaty itself,—has only now accepted it at the end of eight years; Belgium has certainly a right to demand the revisal of an account which was made without her concurrence, and to which she can oppose the official account given in by William himself in 1829. How can the interest of the Austro-Belgic debt, which, in 1829, was 403,610 florins, have risen in 1831 to 750,000 florins? How is it possible that the debts contracted during the union of the two countries, which were stated in 1829 to require only an annual appropriation of 4,191,760 florins, should, in 1831, have amounted to an interest of 10,500,000 florins? If Holland have not deceived the conference, and if the rich kingdom of the Low Countries has really expended, as it is affirmed by the Dutch plenipotentiaries, 307,000,000 of florins beyond its revenues, under the government of the House of Orange, Belgium, though she would have cause to curse so prodigal and disastrous an administration, would, nevertheless, we own it, be bound to submit and pay her share, always, however, with a reservation of the indemnity she is entitled to, for the expenses occasioned by King William's delay in accepting the treaty. But the *letter* of the treaty will not be violated, if in 1838 the conference should require from this prince what no man of honour would think of refusing,—an account which Belgium should be allowed to examine and contest.—Then will be laid open the *working* of the syndicate, and it will be seen how much of the debt of 307,000,000 has really been expended for the kingdom of the Low Countries, either in discharging old debts, or in internal improvements. The protocol of the 6th of October, divides these expenses in two equal shares between the two countries, and though Belgium would even thus be a loser, as the sinking fund was almost exclusively applied to the old Dutch debts, yet, to this, she must of course submit. But as to the loans which had been authorized by law, and had not been negotiated in 1830 by the *syndicate*; and as to the 30,000,000 florins lent to the Dutch colonies in India, and for which they still pay interest to the *syndicate*; and as to the bonds of the *syndicate*, exchanged against the postponed Dutch debt, and which, instead of extinguish-

ing that debt, have only given it a new form,—these are items which the conference, whatever were its intentions, has never formally allotted to Holland, and, consequently, they may be re-examined. It is for England and France to take advantage of the right they have, according to all rules hitherto observed in the settlement of accounts, and to settle the differences between Holland and Belgium to their mutual advantage, and so as to secure to the constitutional governments that ascendancy in Europe which they lost in 1831. We feel quite certain, that any calculation, even if liberal to King William, must reduce by at least one half the debt attributed to Belgium by the twenty-four articles; and that against the demand for arrears, and for an annual tribute of 600,000 florins, upon the plea of compensation for commercial advantages now nearly useless to her, she may set off the enormous expense of her army; for it will not be denied, that she was obliged in common prudence to keep up a war establishment in presence of the enemy who had previously invaded her territory in spite of the armistice concluded in 1830, and guaranteed by the five great powers. The question of the debt thus equitably disposed of—that of territory will arise; and since, under pretence that the peace of the world required its interference, the conference has constituted itself supreme arbitrator between Belgium and Holland, it may easily consult their mutual rights under the treaty of the 15th of November, by settling the money value of those districts of Luxembourg and Limbourg, which were given up to Holland, and restoring them to Belgium, upon condition of her paying to Holland what they are worth. If the inhabitants of these districts were averse to such a proceeding, we should be the last to propose it; but the violence and unanimity of their protestations leave no doubt as to their sentiments. Provinces have been sold against their will, like flocks of sheep; but here we need fear no complaint from those who may be redeemed by money from the yoke of William. We have no doubt, that such an arrangement as this—equally equitable and easy of execution, would be as popular in Holland as in Belgium—and that it would meet with no opposition except from King William, and from those who wish to fortify the alliance of the absolute powers by giving them Luxembourg as a passage in time of war into France, or by exposing France herself to the temptation of one day separating from England, in order to get possession of Belgium when dismantled and enfeebled. We have a vital interest in counteracting these schemes, by protecting the son-in-law of Louis Philippe and ourselves against any such casualties. But as we said at the beginning of our article, the future prospects of our trade and manufactures are also at

stake. Belgium—tranquil and flourishing, will be to Europe the great missionary of freedom of commerce. In three years her railways will reach the French frontiers at Lille and Valenciennes. In the same time they will reach the Prussian frontier at Aix la Chapelle. Then let the Prussian and French governments do what they can, they will not be able in this age of improvement to prevent their being continued up to Paris and to the Rhine; prohibitive duties and direct prohibitions will then be alike impracticable, and our merchandise will find innumerable consumers. Such are the future prospects which the firmness of our ministers may now, and ought to open to us. Let them not lose sight of the influence which the Belgian railways must have upon the future destinies of our commerce. And let them give thanks to Providence, that in defending our best interests, they will also defend the cause of liberty and of justice.

ART. IX.—*First and Second Reports of the Commissioners appointed to consider and recommend a General System of Railways for Ireland; presented to both Houses of Parliament by command of Her Majesty.*

MR. DRUMMOND, Under-Secretary for Ireland; Colonel Burgoyne, Chairman of the Irish Board of Works; Mr. Barlow, Professor of Mathematics at Woolwich: and Mr. Griffith, civil engineer, were appointed, in October 1836, commissioners to inquire into the manner in which railway communications can be most advantageously promoted in Ireland. They presented a short preliminary report in March 1837, and were re-appointed, under the new reign, in the November of that year. Their second and final report is now before us; and we look upon it as containing the best and most recent information not only on the important subject of railways, but the general statistics of Ireland.

This elaborate compilation is divided into three parts. The first exhibits the circumstances to be considered in laying out a system of railways in Ireland. The second shews the probable return which would be required to conduct and work the proposed lines. And the third is an inquiry into the circumstances peculiar to the situation of Ireland, and the present condition of its inhabitants, which would render the promotion of these works, or any of them, an object of national importance, and into the means by which it might be necessary or advisable to promote them.

The population of Ireland, supposed at present to be 8,523,000,* is very unequally distributed over the surface of the island. Some of the northern counties† are the most densely inhabited, but the proportion of heads to the square mile is large in several parts of Leinster and Munster. The condition of the people is as unequal as their distribution. It is not best where there would appear to be least “pressure on subsistence,” as the Malthusians would term it. On the contrary, districts in which there are most mouths, enjoy far above the average comforts in food, clothing, and habitations. The most productive counties are by no means the most thickly peopled; and, if an opinion were to be founded upon what is witnessed in localities not even of third-rate fertility, sustenance could be drawn, with ease, from the Irish soil for triple its present population.

The commissioners make the common remark as to the superiority of the general condition of the population of the northern counties. “They are a frugal, industrious, and intelligent race, inhabiting a district for the most part inferior in natural fertility to the southern portion of Ireland, but cultivating it better, and paying higher rents in proportion to the quality of the land, notwithstanding the higher rate of wages.”

The “plantation” of Ulster, utterly opposed as it was to the law of civilized nations, and monstrous as was its injustice to the natives, had in it, nevertheless, the elements of much good. It created a large resident proprietary, upon whom it imposed the imperative duty of improving the land, and bettering the condition of its cultivators. One of the obligations of an English or Scotch undertaker, was that he should live five years on his estate, or place some other person to act for him, and to be resident five years. He was to erect certain buildings, and effect other improvements within the time. To encourage him in his operations, he was at liberty to “send for, and bring into, Ireland, out of Great Britain, victuals and utensils for his household, materials and tools for building, and husbandry, and stock to manure the lands, without paying any custom for the same.” He was to have sufficient timber out of His Majesty’s woods, “without paying anything for the same,” for two years. Better than all, he was to make *certain estates to tenants*, and “forbear Irish exactions.” The natives were, in all instances, placed

* In 1731, the amount was	-	-	-	2,010,000
1791	-	-	-	4,206,000
1821	-	-	-	6,801,000
1831	-	-	-	7,767,000
1834	-	-	-	7,943,000

† Armagh, Monaghan, and parts of Antrim and Down.

under worse conditions ; but such as were permitted to share in the new distribution were allowed estates in fee-farm, on the condition of erecting certain buildings, granting interests for lives or years to their dependents, abstaining from Irish exactions, and “using tillage and husbandry after the manner of the English Pale;”—a manner, it must be confessed, somewhat preferable to that of the Irish, amongst whom “*ploughing by the tail*” was prevalent far later than the commencement of the seventeenth century.* Under these circumstances, a great stimulus to improvement must have been given in the north of Ireland more than two centuries ago, and the effects cannot but be perceptible in the present times. The north escaped the worst visitation of the Cromwellian usurpation, and of the more recent calamities of the Williamite revolution. It should, then, be far before most of the other portions of the island in all the marks of an advanced civilization. Certain advantages the general face of its territory exhibits, but there is much of real misery which the eye of the traveller does not discern. The natives, who were marked out for a slow proscription in the original scheme of the “plantation,” were gradually driven in succeeding times to the mountains. “The people whose condition appears to be hardest, are,” says Mr. Wakefield, “the Roman Catholics who reside in the mountainous districts. They are descended from the original inhabitants, who retired for shelter to remote places, when the fertile parts fell into the hands of their powerful invaders. The situation of these people often reminded me of the natives of Jamaica, who were driven to the northern and eastern mountains of that island when it was taken by the Spaniards in 1655. Living as a separate people, whose intercourse with their neighbours is exceedingly limited, they have acquired peculiar habits and customs, and are inferior to the other inhabitants in education and industry.” The Rev. Mr. Sampson, the author of the *Survey of Derry*, observes, that “the Scythian custom of feeding on blood has something like a revival in the mountains of that country.” “I actually,” he adds, “surprised the poor inmates of a herdsman’s house, in one of my rambles through unfrequented parts ; five children, with the father and mother, were

* An unwilling witness thus speaks of the ancient condition of Ireland :—“There is good reason to believe, that in the sixth, seventh, and eighth centuries, the Irish were possessed of a respectable share of those benefits which result from industry, laws, and literature, with, perhaps, as much tranquillity, public and private, as was enjoyed by Greece at its most brilliant period. But, amidst the rapine and massacre of the three following ages, their spirit and their imperfect civilization sank together.”—*William Phelan, D. D., formerly a Fellow of Trinity College, and author of several Anti-Catholic Tracts.* The “ferocity of the northern Corsairs” was the cause of this lamentable retrogression : what they commenced, it was the British policy of five hundred years to complete.

eating blood, thickened by boiling it, with no other addition." This is the reverse of the picture usually drawn of northern prosperity, and it has no parallel in the worst portions of the southern districts. On the whole, however, Ulster unquestionably sustains the account the commissioners give of its comparative advantages. A good deal is due to its landlords, for a tenant is always certain of getting something for any holding in his possession, though his tenure be only from year to year; and this is scarcely to be said of other provinces, even in those instances in which most praises are claimed for the munificence of the lord of the soil. The linen manufacture has unquestionably contributed not a little to those appearances of superiority which Ulster presents. But why has that province had the chief advantages of that manufacture? Mr. Newenham observes, that "the immunities enjoyed exclusively by Protestant weavers, wheelmakers, flax dressers, and others, under the 19 Geo. II, c. 6, probably contributed to confine the linen manufacture, in a great degree, to the province of Ulster, where the Protestants of the lower class were much more numerous in proportion to the Roman Catholics, than in the other provinces."

Ulster does not more differ in certain peculiarities of its general aspect from Leinster, than Leinster does from Munster, and than Munster does from Connaught. The human race is the same all over the world, altered alone by the circumstances in which it happens to be placed. This is certainly the case with regard to the Irish, as ten thousand facts incontestibly prove. They are the creatures of circumstances in all quarters of the island; but let it not be understood that we contemplate a state of things over which they themselves have in no case any control. We should consider it a crime to palliate the faults of our countrymen, and our fear is, that flattery has done them much harm. Many evils under which portions of them labour, are the fruit of their own improvidence; and if the whole people resolved in good earnest to reform whatever there is of frivolity, intemperance, and indolence amongst themselves, more than could easily be estimated would be done, by this act alone, in raising them in the social scale. The commissioners remark that, "in proportion as wages fall below a fair standard of compensation, the work received in return will be dear." The meaning, of course, is, that the less the pay, the less will be the performance; but the habit of reducing the work to the standard of the remuneration, has produced a tendency to inertness, even when the compensation is above the average. It has been asserted by persons who have had experience of the fact, that the labour on an agricultural farm in England will not cost more than on one

in Ireland circumstanced similarly, though there will be thirty-three or forty per cent. difference in the respective rates of wages. There may be some exaggeration in the statement, but assured we are that it has foundation enough to warrant the serious consideration of the working classes in Ireland, and to demand the attention of those whose duty it is to instruct them in the pulpit and by the press. Drukenness is, we fear, by no means a decreasing vice in Ireland; and no fact exhibits Irish affairs in a more discouraging aspect, than that the amount of the whiskey and the tobacco tax approaches very nearly to one-half its entire revenue. The tobacco tax in the last year produced £762,493, being very considerably above the amount of former years. The tobacco tax of England is not much more than three times this magnitude, though the taxes on other articles of consumption in that country yield from seven to ten times the amount realized in Ireland. We speak of articles on which the duty is exactly similar in both countries, such as tea, wine, sugar, malt, fruits, and spices. The newspaper stamps issued in England are ten times the amount of those issued in Ireland, though there is now no material difference in the price. If reading were as general in Ireland as smoking, the circulation of newspapers would be more than three times the present amount. Whiskey, paying the queen's duty, produced a revenue of £1,374,429; and there is too much reason to believe that the consumption of the illegal article is, at least, equal to that of the legal. No doubt, Scotland exceeds Ireland in the amount of this pernicious stimulant reserved for home consumption, but there are comparatively more mouths to swallow it there, and it is taken in smaller doses on each occasion. Every Scotchman of a certain class takes some whiskey every day, but takes it methodically. This is not the case in Ireland. There are many who do not drink at all, or drink rarely, and, therefore, the classes whose deplorable addictions make up the enormous amount of revenue stated, do it at the cost of an intemperance rendering but too many of them burthens to themselves and pests to society. Ireland cannot be "as she ought to be," until the habits of a large portion of her population in this and other respects are wholly reclaimed.

The general view the commissioners give of the state of the country with reference either to agriculture or commerce, does not differ much from that taken by ourselves on a former occasion.* There is a move onwards, but it is slow, inadequate, and little perceptible, at least, in the traces it leaves on the domestic condition of the mass of the people. It would appear from the

* Dublin Review, vol. ii. p. 281.

following table, that there was a great increase of imports as well as exports between 1825 and 1835; but the commissioners properly state, that it does not warrant them in assuming “that any considerable portion of the increased consumption is shared by the labouring population,” the demand appearing “to proceed exclusively from the superior class of landholders and the inhabitants of towns.”

EXPORTS.

	1825.	1835.
Cows and Oxen, in number	63,524	98,150
Sheep - - - -	72,191	125,452
Swine - - - -	65,919	376,191
Wheat, in quarters -	283,340	420,522
Barley - - - -	154,822	168,946
Oats - - - -	1,503,204	1,575,984
Meal and Flour, in cwts.	599,124	1,984,480
Butter - - - -	474,161	872,009
Beer, in gallons - -		2,686,688
Linen, in yards - -	55,114,515	70,365,572

IMPORTS.

	1825.	1835.
Cotton Manufactures, in yards	4,996,885	14,172,000
Woollen Manufactures	3,384,918	7,884,000
Tea, in lbs. - - -	3,889,658	4,794,316
Coffee - - - -	335,921	1,205,762

In the interval indicated, the population increased nearly one million of souls, and we take the test of revenue to be less delusive as to the actual state of things than most of the items of this table. In 1825, it was (payments into the Exchequer) £3,690,000; in 1835, the amount, as set down in the finance accounts, was £3,767,000, but this included only a portion of the tea duty, then principally collected in British ports; we may probably add £350,000 on account of tea, making the total £4,117,000, or an excess over the receipts of 1825, of £427,000. Much of this, however, was produced even by the saving which arose from a reduction of the charges on the collection of the revenue,* and there was an enormous increase in the unfortunate item of whiskey! In 1825, the produce was £771,690,—in 1835, £1,494,835, or £679,878, above the amount of 1825!!—Some allowance is to be made for certain modifications or remissions in the taxes, but it is not considerable, and, on the whole, the state of the revenue in 1835, must be admitted to have been far from reconcilable with those indications of rapid advancement

* The rate per cent. at which the Irish revenue was collected in 1825, was £16. 0s. 1d.; the rate in 1835, was £12. 2s. 4½d.

which many will fancy to be clearly perceptible in the table before us. Besides, if there has been an increase in the exportation of linen, there has been a falling off in cottons and woollens. Belfast is the only town in which the cotton trade has been established to any extent, and in that trade it has now only six mills employed. The value of the woollen manufacture of Dublin and its vicinity, has fallen off to less than one-half. In Cork, Kilkenny, Moate, and Carrick-on-Suir, the decay has been still more decisive. The flannel trade of Wicklow and Wexford may be considered extinct. On the other hand, it is satisfactory to find, that in worsted articles there is an increased manufacture, and that in woollens, though much less is done than formerly, things are considered to be sound and healthy, and even to afford an expectation of an annual increase. There is a good account of damasks, tabinets, worked muslins, embroidery in silks and satins; to extend which latter beautiful art, schools have in many places been established to instruct the female peasantry. Milling has been making great progress for years, as well as porter brewing for English consumption, and beef and butter are represented as bringing prices in the English markets founded on *quality* which they never did before. There is an increased traffic on the canals. The mining operations are latterly growing brisk. Yet the situation of the agricultural population is such, that “milk is almost become a luxury to many of them, and the quality of their potato diet is generally much inferior to what it was at the commencement of the present century. A species of potato, called the ‘Lumper,’ has been brought into general cultivation on account of its great productiveness, and the facility with which it can be raised from an inferior soil, and with a comparatively small portion of manure. This root, at its first introduction, was scarcely considered food good enough for swine; it neither possesses the farinaceous qualities of the better varieties of the plant, nor is it as palatable as any other, being wet and tasteless, and in point of substantial nutriment, little better as an article of human food than a Swedish turnip. In many counties of Leinster, and throughout the provinces of Munster and Connaught, the lumper now constitutes the principal food of the labouring peasantry.”* Such is the account of the agricultural population, and as to the people generally, their condition may be inferred from their clothing. “The consumption of woollens in Ireland is much below that of an equal population in England. Mr Willans calculates, that the annual value of the woollens sold in Ireland, does not exceed £1,400,000, being about 3s. 3d.

* Second Report, p. 81.

per head on the population; whereas the total consumption in England cannot be less in value than from £18,000,000 to £20,000,000, which would amount to 20s. per head.”*

That Ireland wants great help from some quarter, is, then, but too evident. Of the extraordinary utility of public works, all accounts speak in terms the most striking:—

“ On prudential considerations, (say the commissioners), we should not hesitate to recommend an immediate and liberal attention to the claims of Ireland for assistance, which cannot be conferred in any shape more likely to prove beneficial than by encouraging public works of extensive and permanent utility. It is a waste of the public available resources to suffer so large a portion of the empire to lie fallow, or leave it to struggle by slow advances and defective means towards its own improvement, when the judicious aid of the State might quickly make it a source of common strength and advantage.

“ The policy of rendering such assistance is unquestionable. It is acknowledged to be necessary towards a colony, and must be considered more so in the case of a part of the United Kingdom, comprehended within its domestic boundaries, where neither the land nor the population can continue to be useless, without being hurtful at the same time, and nearly in the same degree. Looking, therefore, at the proposition as a mere account or estimate of profit and loss, the balance is clearly in favour of a prompt and liberal encouragement on the part of the Legislature, to whatever tends manifestly to call into action the great powers and capabilities of this fine country. In every instance in which such encouragement has been afforded, even in the construction of a common road, the returns to the State in improved revenue have hitherto more than repaid the public outlay; and viewed in this light, public assistance, well directed and applied with judgment and economy, is, in effect, a beneficial expenditure of capital, similar in kind to that which a provident landlord makes for the improvement of his estate.”

A railway is a public work of which all experience has proved the signal advantages. Its ordinary effects in England, are to triple and even quadruple the former intercourse between localities. On the Stockton and Darlington line, passengers have increased from 280 or 300 per week, to 2,500; on the Newcastle and Carlisle, from 343 to 1,596; and on the Dundee and Newtyle, from 4,000 to 50,000. In foreign countries the results are still more striking, as an instance of which it may be mentioned, that the passengers on the Brussels and Antwerp line have increased from 75,000 to 1,200,000. Even to steam-vessel traffic, railways appear to be of great importance; the passengers between Hull and Selby, before the Leeds and Selby railway was constructed, were 32,882; they are since 62,105.

* Second Report, p. 8.

In Ireland, unfortunately, reference cannot as yet be made to more than one railway undertaking in actual operation. There is a short line from Dublin to Kingstown. Without the aid of reduced charges, or any great saving in point of time, it has, beyond question, greatly increased intercourse. And it is curious that it has not been attended with the ruinous consequences which were anticipated to the owners of the former conveyances. They are still found in great numbers on the celebrated "Rock" road, plying for full fare, although with diminished burthens, to points off the direct line to Kingstown, and they draw not a small profit from an entirely new branch of business, that of conveying passengers to the railway station from all quarters of the city.

The canals and the navigation of the Shannon may be referred to as evidence of the practicability of greatly increasing intercourse. The tolls of the Grand Canal which were £24,866 in 1822, were £40,859 in 1837. This rapid augmentation of receipts was chiefly produced by the conveyance of valuable articles. The increase of the tons of flour was from 9,805 to 28,378; and of the tons of cattle and pigs, from 10 to 1,942. The Royal Canal is not in an equal state of prosperity, but still it is on the advance, for the receipts which, in 1834 were £24,000, were £25,148 in 1836. The Barrow navigation is rapidly improving, and bids fair shortly to realize the expectations of the projectors; we have the same account of the Newry navigation. On the Shannon, the tonnage has had, from 1826 to 1836, the extraordinary increase of from 2,004 to 47,289. These facts as to the inland navigation are the more necessary to be stated, because it has recently been alleged, with the greatest confidence, that it is useless and unprofitable, yielding scarcely what is sufficient to pay the expense of its attendant "repairs."* The Grand Canal is not a flourishing concern to the representatives of the persons who originally embarked their money in it, simply because it cost more than double what it should, and was soon harassed by the insane competition of the Royal Canal, set on foot by "a director of the Grand Canal, who, seceding from that company on account of some trifling differences, resolved to form a rival company." On the two canals, two millions of money were irretrievably wasted. The cost per mile of the Grand Canal, was £8,442—that of the Royal Canal £10,780; but both could easily have been kept within an expenditure of £3,800. Under such circumstances, inland navigation, as far at least as regards these canals, must have been very unproductive to the original speculators. But that a good return is had for the capital

* Standard Newspaper, September 10.

latterly embarked, is proved by the market price of the debentures, which is high and on the advance.

Having come to the conclusion, that it is expedient to introduce railways on an extended scale into Ireland, the commissioners next proceeded to decide on the *lines* “best calculated to prove beneficial, and to afford the greatest return on the capital expended.” The considerations which guide them, are properly the amount of population which would be benefitted—the condition of that population and their power to profit by the advantages of railway communication,—the industry and comparative commercial activity prevailing among them,—the comparative amount of traffic and number of passengers,—the great towns which would be connected by the least extent of railway,—the singular fertility of many of the southern districts,—their capabilities of great and extensive improvement,—the facilities which they afford for the construction of railways,—the importance of connecting Dublin with Cork, Limerick, Waterford, and Kilkenny, and with Belfast in the north; and the regard that is due to the existing canal and river navigations.

On these various grounds, the commissioners have convinced themselves, “that the two great lines which would open the country in the most advantageous manner, confer the most extensive accommodation at the smallest outlay, and afford the greatest return on capital,” would be, one taking a southern and the other a northern direction.

They describe the lines, going into details with which we do not feel that we ought to detain the general reader. Cork, they select as the southern terminus, and Belfast as the northern. They propose, that the main southern line should take its course to Maryborough, and that a branch should be thrown off from thence to Kilkenny. From Maryborough they mark out “a very easily traversed country,” by Thurles to Holycross, from which they recommend that a second branch should be formed, “which, sweeping close round the Keeper Mountains, would run through the rich district of the Golden Vale to Limerick, while the main branch continuing its course through Cashel, and winding round the base of the Galties Mountains, close to Cahir, would pass through Mallow to Cork.” The northern line, which they prefer, is one that would run through Navan. From this they say, “a branch might be easily carried by Kells and Virginia to Cavan and Enniskillen. From Navan, the main line continuing its course to the north, should pass by Castleblaney to Armagh, and thence to Belfast.”

If there were no interests to be regarded but those of the public at large, there are few, we believe, who would object to

this plan of an extended line of railways, the object being to do, in the first instance, what is best and most practical, under all the circumstances of the country, moral and physical. There are, however, local speculations already at some maturity, and others no doubt in embryo; and as a project, which aims at being strictly national, must unavoidably clash with all or most of such ventures, there are many who are open and angry accusers of the railway commissioners. The Irish press has been loaded with their reclamations, and they have even contrived to enlist in their service some prominent journals on the east side of the channel. The systematic assailants of the government have given them a willing aid, simply because the principal commissioner was Mr. Drummond, whose valuable, though unobtrusive, efforts to secure to Ireland the advantages of really impartial government, have been too remarkable, and, indeed, too signally triumphant, to be ever forgotten. The charges allege not only ignorance but *corruption*. Mr. Drummond, Colonel Burgoyne, Mr. Barlow, and Mr. Griffith, are represented as being only so many instruments of a job concocted by Mr. Mahony, the eminent solicitor, and to which all the facilities of legislation, and all the pecuniary encouragement at the command of the executive, are to be rendered subsidiary for that gentleman's individual profit! The grounds of this adventurous and really amusing calumny are worth being stated.

Mr. Mahony has for years been engaged in railway transactions, and he was connected with some capitalists who meditated the formation of a South-western line. The commissioners sought information in all quarters; and it appears by a letter from that gentleman, of the date of the 2nd of December 1836, that, amongst others, they applied to him. What they particularly desired was a statement of the facts connected with the south-western project. He furnished ample details, and in reference to a survey intended by the capitalists alluded to, wrote as follows:—

“Assuming that such a proceeding comes within the scope and intent of the commission, my friends direct me to convey to the board their earnest and respectful request that the survey so long contemplated may now be undertaken, with a view to its immediate completion under the direction of the commissioners, but, of course, at the expense of the parties promoting it; and in this view I am directed to state, that they are ready to pay into the hands of the commissioners the sum of one thousand pounds, and to render themselves accountable in any way satisfactory to the commissioners for any farther sums which may be found necessary.”

In drawing up their report, the commissioners alluded to this proposition in a note couched in the following words :—

“ So long back as December 1836, a body of capitalists, represented by Pierce Mahony, Esq., after an interview with the chief secretary, communicated to the commissioners a readiness to undertake any line to the south-west that they should recommend, and offered to contribute one thousand pounds towards making the necessary survey ; and in May, 1838, they repeated their desire, on understanding that the commissioners' report would be very shortly after presented to parliament.”

This note does not appear in the authorized report of the commissioners' proceedings, though there is little doubt that it was printed in the original proof sheets. Mr. Mahony's letter is given at length in an appendix, and it is to be presumed that when there was a final reading of the proofs at a meeting of all the commissioners, one of them referring to the appendix, suggested that the note was needless, and the rest assented at once to its omission, the matter not being deserving of one second's consideration. Be this as it may, the text in Mr. Mahony's letter, and the commentary in the cancelled note, furnish the whole evidence on which the commissioners are accused of corruption ! The miserable and really disgraceful farrago in the way of argument by which the accusation is attempted to be sustained is not worth the trouble of exposure. It is merely to be referred to as evidence of the inconceivable audacity of the experiments which are sometimes tried upon the public credulity.

If the commissioners lent themselves to a job of Mr. Mahony's, it must be admitted that they did it on conditions of a character little calculated to render it profitable. That gentleman is the representative of a body of wealthy persons, whom he is said to be anxious to allure into a wholesale expenditure of capital. The help the commissioners lend to his designs, in the first place, is, a declaration that nothing but a “general system of railways” should be encouraged ; and that on such a system the return could not be expected for some time to exceed $3\frac{1}{2}$ or 4 per cent. They will not allow his friends to take possession of “the best and most productive lines.” To do this would, they say, completely frustrate the most important objects contemplated in issuing their commission, by opposing a bar to the future improvement of the country. They trust that such an act “will not in any case [even to oblige Mr. Mahony] be permitted,” and they avow openly that it would be more advisable that no partial line should be sanctioned until the country should possess within itself the means of undertaking the whole system to its full extent, than at once and for ever to obstruct and paralyse all

future exertions for its accomplishment by abandoning to parties having particular and distinct interests [such for instance as Mr. Mahony's capitalists] the monopoly of some of its most productive and detached portions." Not contented with this opinion they do not hesitate to express a doubt that, "any company will be induced to undertake either of the great lines" described. Their opinion clearly is, and they are even forward in proclaiming it, that the government should do the work which they are accused of desiring to throw, as a monopoly, into the hands of Mr. Mahony's company. If even that company were to be the sole undertakers of the great lines proposed, these conspiring commissioners would subject their operations to a surveillance little contributory it must be allowed to the convenience or advantage of a job. Power and privileges have, they say, been conceded to private companies, which should be exercised only under the direct authority of the state, or under regulations enforced by effective superintendence and control. As an illustration, they refer to rate of speed, the choice of hours for departing, the number of journeys performed in the day, and the charges made for goods and passengers, all of which are at present left at the discretion of the various companies. To show that discretion may not always be exercised with a view to public convenience, they point to a regulation meditated in some quarters *of suspending all intercourse by railways on Sundays!* "A junction of two lines near Birmingham might readily have been effected, and by that means the inconvenience and delay of transferring goods and passengers avoided." The respective companies, however, being without control, give way to the influence of an unworthy jealousy, or a total indifference to the public accommodation, and leave the grievance unredressed. For this evil, and all the others, the commissioners would provide the remedy stated. Very anxious, confessedly, does it prove them to throw fences round the public rights, but we apprehend it does not supply as decisive evidence of their desire to further the ends of a job. Enough, however,—indeed more than enough,—on this preposterous accusation.*

* M. Dupin, who visited Ireland some twenty years ago, described a job of that day in the following words:—"The Irish senators who vote with the ministers, that is to say, almost the whole, receive as a reward the patronage of their respective *municipia*. Their creatures are chosen for the subordinate offices. Their interests are religiously consulted, and their passions generously seconded in the discussion of all questions of interior administration, undertakings, and public works; so that what is done for the state in the name of the general interest, is almost always directed by some private interest, and often turns against the interest of the community. Every operation of this kind is a job. It is the work of jobbers ('jobbeurs'). As soon as there appears a new act for the execution of a certain project, the Irish do not occupy themselves in seeing whether the thing be good in itself or not—they have concluded

The *Economy of Railways* is a portion of the Report which has interest for persons in all countries concerned in works of this description.

Form of Rail. The rail itself, the chair it rests on, and the supports of the chair, have since the commencement of railways been subject to constant changes, and no principle as yet employed can be confidently recommended. Stone blocks as well as wood blocks are used as supports for the chairs, and they are sometimes laid transversely and sometimes longitudinally. The joints of the rails are "half-lapped" as well as "scarfed," and there are frequently plain "butting" joints used. Even the distance of the blocks has been varied from three to four or five feet, and rails of increased strength substituted accordingly. In these and other instances there have been alterations productive of expenses so great as materially to depreciate the value of lines even of very extensive traffic.

Mode of laying. Whether stone blocks or wooden longitudinal sleepers are better is a question on which great difference of opinion exists. We believe the majority are in favour of the latter; but when stone is very plentiful and cheap there is a natural inclination to prefer it. Large stone blocks and heavy rails, supported at greater intervals than formerly, seem now universally admitted to be more economical than lighter rails resting on blocks at shorter distances.

Breadth of way. The ordinary distance between the wheels is now from four feet and a half to five, and it is deemed expedient to extend it to six feet two inches.

"It is clearly advantageous to reduce the friction on the axle, and the resistance on the rails, as much as possible, which, all other things being the same, will be inversely proportional to the diameter of the wheels. It is also advantageous to keep the centre of gravity of the load as low as possible, for, from the nature of the conical figure given to the bearing part of the wheel, the carriages are in a constant state of lateral oscillation, and the less the height of the centre of gravity, the less of this effect will be produced; the less also will be the wear and tear of the carriages, and the more easy and pleasant the motion to the passengers.

"From the nature of the locomotive engine, its power is so great in proportion to the friction it has to overcome, that it is capable of drawing a load which (even with a greatly increased breadth as compared with common road carriages) extends to a very considerable length; and in

beforehand that it is a job, and the sharpness of their wit is only exercised in guessing by what local views, and secret paths, the work of iniquity has been brought about. What a country! where society, corrupted by a bad government, no longer even believe in the existence of public virtue." We thought we had passed the times in which this picture was true of our public undertakings, our governors, or the critics of their acts.

order to reduce this length as much as possible, it is necessary, with the present breadth of way, to make the wheels run within the frame which supports the carriage; the seats of the carriages are, therefore, placed above the periphery of the wheel; the load is thus disadvantageously raised, and in order not to increase the evil more than is actually necessary, the wheels are made proportionally small, which causes a greater amount of friction than would be otherwise incurred, and gives a less power of overcoming the resistance of the rail.

“Now, these inconveniences may certainly be avoided, preserving the same carriage room (which, from its adoption on most lines, it is to be presumed is found most convenient), by extending the breadth of bearing of the rails, so as to let the wheels run outside the frame, instead of running within it.

“This, with a slightly modified form of carriage, will admit of the diameter of the wheels being increased, thereby reducing the friction and increasing the power to overcome surface resistance, at the same time that the load itself may be reduced in height, being in this case limited by the axle of the larger wheel, instead of the upper part of the periphery of the less wheel; and with this reduction of height, the wear and tear will be reduced, and the smoothness and ease of the motion increased. Moreover, the force to be overcome being less, with the same load, we may, by retaining the power of the engine the same, carry a greater load than at present with the same velocity; or, by retaining the present load, carry it at a greater velocity, by increasing the diameter of the driving wheels of the engine; or if it be not desirable to increase the velocity, the speed of the piston might be reduced, which would be a great practical advantage; or, lastly, preserving the same load and velocity, the power and weight of the engine may be made less; and probably the one or the other of these arrangements would be adopted, according to the nature of the traffic on the road. Thus, in passenger and mail transit, it might be found desirable to increase velocity, whereas, in the carriage of heavy goods, mineral productions, &c. it would be most economical to increase the load.

“There is, however, one important point connected with this innovation which must not be overlooked, viz. that the whole of the advantages pointed out apply only to horizontal lines. Now, generally, lines of railway have various gradients, or inclined planes, in ascending which the load has to be raised in opposition to gravity; and the power necessary to effect this is frequently equal to, or exceeds, that which is employed to overcome the friction, and will remain the same to whatever extent the friction is reduced.

“In order, therefore, to avail ourselves fully of the reduced friction, those planes which are not worked by assisting power, require to be reduced in their slopes, in the same proportion as the wheels are increased; or otherwise that assisting power be applied on proportionally less slopes than according to the present practice. In other words, the power of the engine is employed in overcoming the friction of the road, and in raising it up the several gradients; and what is gained by opening the rails, and making the wheels run outside the frame, applies only to

the former, the latter remaining the same as before ; and the advantages of the alteration would be overstated, if this circumstance were not taken into consideration.

“ But even with this deduction, the advantage is considerable, particularly as regards the convenience it would afford the engineer in disposing of the several parts of the engine gear of the locomotive ; and there can be no doubt, in a new country, as regards railways, that provision ought to be made for taking advantage of this improved practice, and for securing uniformity of breadth. The only question is, therefore, what that breadth should be ? The frames of the present carriages are about six feet in width ; without, therefore, interfering with the convenience of the present coaches, or by only contracting their breadth a very little, the wheels might be made to run outside the frame, by increasing the present distance of the lines to six feet two inches. This would allow of wheels of four or five feet in diameter, which would reduce the amount of friction in the proportion of ten to seven ; a greater distance, as seven feet, would allow, perhaps, wheels of six-and-a-half or seven feet in diameter, which would reduce the friction by nearly one-half ; but it is questionable whether the distances should be so far extended and enforced as a part of a general system, particularly when it is considered that the more the friction is reduced, the greater will be the proportional impediment presented by the gradients on the line.”

All points considered, the commissioners recommend an uniform distance of “ railway lines for Ireland, of six feet two inches, which will have the effect of greatly reducing the friction, while, by lowering the centre of gravity of the load, the present vibratory motion of the carriage will be greatly diminished, and, consequently, also, the wear and tear of both the carriages and the line of way ; advantages which, it is to be presumed, will be cheaply purchased by a small addition to the first outlay.”

Effect of Curves. It does not appear that curves are so injurious to the working of a railway as might be supposed, but, at the same time, it is desirable to employ them as little as possible, and to form them, when necessary, of the largest practicable radius. A curve on the Boston and Leigh railway, of a quarter of a mile radius, is subjected, nearly every day, to the action of a train moving, in order to surmount an inclination, at the maximum velocity (thirty miles per hour), and no accident has ever happened from it, though the wear and tear of wheels and axles is very perceptible. The effects have been found similar in various other instances.

Absorbed Power. The power lost in putting a train in motion is found to be nearly one-third of the whole ; and hence there is an obvious economy in conveying goods and passengers in the largest possible masses. The relative expenditure of steam power per ton per mile, is nearly six times greater for a load of

ten tons than for one of 100. To this ascertained fact, the commissioners refer as a convincing proof of the necessity of a large and uniform traffic in every railway undertaking, and the ruinous consequences which must follow from allowing rival lines, or such as shall divide between them the traffic, the whole of which is so essential, if even adequate, to the maintenance of either.

Gradients. A gradient is generally understood to be a slope of small inclination, up which a train may be taken (with, of course, diminished velocity) without assisting power. The effect of a gradient in retarding a load varies with the amount of the load, the dimensions of the engine, and the degree of inclination. The steam power necessary to overcome a resistance of $\frac{1}{280}$ th of a load, is expressed by $\frac{1}{140}$ th of the same when the gross load amounts to 100 tons, and by $\frac{1}{70}$ th when the load is fifty tons. While, therefore, the power of traction is doubled in ascending a gradient of one in 280, the requisite steam power will only be increased about one-third with 100 tons, and by little more than one-fourth with fifty tons. In cases, therefore, where only a moderate traffic is to be expected, an expense of great excavations and embankments, indispensable when the traffic is more extensive, may be avoided.

Cost of Railways. What is called a “proved” estimate, is one submitted, on what is deemed sufficient authority, to a parliamentary committee. That the “proved” estimate is frequently a most fallacious guide, is strikingly exhibited in the following comparative statement, published in January 1837, by the directors of the London and Birmingham railway:—

	£	Actual Cost. £	Estimate. £
Land and compensation - - -	-	506,500	250,000
Contract works for forming the road	-	2,146,068	1,703,830
Rails, chairs, blocks, sleepers, and incidental charges - - -	-	693,822	366,977
Buildings, locomotive engines, car- riages, waggons, &c. - - -	-	408,236	80,000
Expenses of Act of Incorporation -	72,869		
Law proceedings, &c. - - -	12,000		
Conveyancing - - -	53,800		
Engineering and surveying -	127,100		
Direction - - -	13,300		
Office charges, salaries, &c. -	27,515		
Printing and advertisements -	4,800		
Sundries - - -	10,600		
		<u>321,984</u>	<u>99,193</u>
		4,076,610	2,500,000

This exhibits an excess amounting to £1,576,600 !* Estimates of forty-eight railways were last year laid before parliament. The united length of the railways proposed to be constructed was 1223 miles, and the estimated cost, £19,352,726, averaging £15,695 per mile. Judging from experience, however, the expense will not fall short of £20,000 per mile ; and there have been instances of the outlay upon railway construction having reached even to £40,000. The sources of this extravagant expenditure are, 1st, parliamentary disbursements, which sometimes amount to £1000 per mile, even on long lines ; 2ndly, the enormous demands of proprietors of lands and tenements for compensation ; 3rdly, the great outlay attendant upon running termini far into towns, and sometimes carrying lines through towns ; and, lastly, the prodigality of engineers in their efforts in many instances to arrive at a needless mechanical perfection. The most formidable of these impediments are clearly within the power of parliamentary regulation ; and, everything duly considered, the commissioners are of opinion that the expenses of the proposed lines in Ireland may be brought as low as £10,000 or £12,000 per mile, at which rate of outlay there is no doubt that they would afford a fair immediate return to the capitalist, with a great prospect of future advantage. At £10,000 per mile, the average profit on the main trunk would be 5.18 per cent. ; at £12,000, 4.32 per cent. ; and at a mean charge of £11,000, 4.75 per cent. There would be a reduced profit on branches ; but it is to be observed, that the estimate of increase on the passenger traffic taken by the commissioners is very low, being only 100 per cent. on the principal class of passengers,† and fifty per cent. on the secondary. All through the report there is evidence of a desire to be rather under the mark than over it ; and we do not think that this is more discernible in any instance than that of the assumed profits of an extended line of railway.

The commissioners view the proposed southern line with reference to its effects on continental as well as British intercourse with America. The southern and western harbours of Ireland are not only nearer to America in geographical position than any other European ports, but more favourably situated as far as regards winds and the currents of the Atlantic. Of these harbours, the commissioners regard Cork either as being, under existing circumstances, most accessible by railways, or as uniting most of those advantages which ought to belong to an appointed

* It would appear, indeed, that the excess was much larger, for, according to a later statement, the actual cost was £4,500,000.

† The first class of passengers is supposed to be those for whom railroads would be a direct, the second for whom they would be an indirect, accommodation.

place of general call; and they recommend that no other measures be taken, in the first instance, with regard to establishing a western port, than such as may be necessary to improve, to the highest degree, the means of communicating with that city. They are of opinion that, "by the construction of the best lines of railway between London and Dublin, and Dublin and Cork, the latter being established as the fixed port of embarkation, a more certain, expeditious, and convenient, if not cheaper, communication, would be effected between Great Britain and America, than by any other instrumentality. Bristol possesses advantages, but they are partial, and there are circumstances which might induce many vessels from that port to touch at Cork.

We may, then (they add), safely urge the construction of these railways as a consideration of national importance quite independent of the amount of direct profit from increased business which the intercourse thus created is likely to produce. "We have reason, moreover, to believe that the policy of adopting the greatest degree of improvement of which such undertakings are susceptible, is not to be estimated by the simple calculations of the manner in which the intercourse between Great Britain and North America might be carried on. We know that it is a question of doubt still pending, whether Havre or some other place in France, or a port of the British empire, shall henceforth become one of general resort for the business to America, of a great part of the continent of Europe: and a favourable result for our own country can only be obtained by the establishment of facilities manifestly superior to those of Havre or other French ports."

Our attention is next challenged by an "inquiry into the practicability of a steam navigation to America." Before the report issued from the press, the great problem was solved; but it is calculated to give confidence in the sound judgment and extensive intelligence which the commissioners brought to the discharge of the important duties which devolved upon them, that before they could borrow any light from experience, they recorded their firm and deliberate opinion, as the result of the most careful and anxious inquiries, that "a transatlantic navigation by steam between Great Britain and America is practicable;" and that they assumed the possibility of the return voyage being performed in fourteen, and the out voyage in sixteen days.*

* It appears that the larger the steam vessel, the greater (all other things being the same) is her capability for speed and length of voyage. In fuel a great additional expenditure may take place, with a very disproportionate augmentation of speed; to increase the speed, in fact, *one-eighth*, requires an additional consumption of fuel of

There is a section "on the most rapid communication between London and Dublin." It appears that there would be little more than four hours difference between the longest and shortest course that could be adopted. By a construction of new railways, the passage to Dublin could be effected *via* Holyhead in seventeen hours fifty-three minutes. By Liverpool, it would require twenty-two hours seventeen minutes, the travelling being at a very high rapidity. By Orme's Bay, the time would be nineteen hours thirty-seven minutes; by Port Dynllaen, about eighteen hours; and by Fishguard, nineteen hours fifty-five minutes and a half. It is observed, that a line through Wales would produce very little accession of business to Wales itself; and it is suggested that as it is not to be expected that such a project can be carried into execution without aid from the public, "it will probably be best to effect it by direct government agency." We cannot help noticing here an intimation relative to the London and Liverpool railway, which has recently been made public. The whole line was open on the 17th of last month, and a change advantageous to the intercourse with Dublin was naturally expected. An alteration has taken place, but it is one which retards till 11 the dispatch of the mail, which previously took place at 9 A. M. No explanation has been given more satisfactory than that the directors have thought proper to *depart from their contract with the Post Office!* A more striking proof of the necessity of that control to which the commissioners would subject the managers of all railways, could not possibly be furnished.

We hasten to the conclusion of the report, which contains "the suggestions and recommendations as to the extent of public aid which it might be advisable to afford, the manner in which it might be given, and under what regulations." The grounds have already been stated on which the commissioners object to partial or detached undertakings. Their earnest recommendation is, "that every effort be made to combine into one interest, and under one management and control, the whole of the

one-fourth. Theoretical principles led the commissioners to this important conclusion, and an experiment on one of the government steamers, which they suggested to the Admiralty, fully confirmed it. A letter from Mr. Peter Barlow, written from Woolwich, gives the details:—"We found," he says, "the pressure of the steam in the boiler, by the steam guage, four pounds per inch; and by the usual trial, ascertained the mean speed per hour to be 8.42 miles. The steam was then reduced to one-and-a-half pound per square inch, as shewn by the same guage, and the mean speed found as before was 8.46 per hour. The result is certainly extraordinary. I anticipated a reduction of the speed, but less in proportion than the reduction of the fuel. We found, however, no change of speed, or, if any, in favour of the lower pressure. Everything was satisfactorily conducted. The time was taken by two persons independently, and Mr. Ewart attended the steam guage and the management of the fire."

southern system of intercommunication between Dublin and Cork, Limerick, Waterford, and Kilkenny; and that the northern line by Navan—to Armagh, at least,—be treated according to the same principle, and considered as one concern.” If a body of capitalists be found ready to undertake either of these great works, as a whole, they assume that the general feeling of the legislature and the country will be to leave the execution of it, as little fettered as possible by restriction, to the management of private enterprize; and, in addition to this, it would (they say) be just and advisable to relieve them from all needless expenses, to which, otherwise, in the existing state of the law, they would be liable. With this view, they recommend particularly that the act of parliament be granted free of any charge, as a public measure; that a mode of determining the amounts to be paid in compensation for land, and damages, be adopted on principles more fixed and independent of private or local bias than the present practice; and that some general enactment be provided, authorizing, to a certain extent, alterations of obvious utility, to be introduced in the original plan, without the costly expedient of resorting in every case to parliament for a new or amended act. Entertaining, however, well-founded doubts whether any company will be induced to undertake either of these great lines, they express a hope that assistance may be expected from the state. They do not enter minutely into the precise form and amount of the aid, but they offer the following suggestions:—

“ 1st, That government should advance by way of loan a considerable proportion of the amount of the estimates, at the lowest rate of interest, and on the easiest terms of repayment, to be secured by a mortgage of the works. We think that many landholders may also be found to subscribe towards carrying into effect an object which, in addition to its importance as a national concern, cannot fail to benefit and improve their own properties.

“ As a farther assistance in filling the subscriptions, perhaps powers might be given to the counties interested, as well as to corporate towns, to become shareholders to certain amounts; the government in such case advancing the money on the security of presentments in the usual manner, and the return on such shares being available for the reduction of the county or other rates. A provision, however, will be necessary in this case to ensure the cooperation of the whole of the districts interested,—the approval of a certain majority having been obtained.

“ If these means be rejected, or fail to produce sufficient subscriptions to insure, in the first instance, the execution of the entire system, we would suggest, that the work might still be allowed to go forward, beginning at Dublin, or other fixed terminus, to any other determinate point, such portion, however, not to be considered an integral line, but only as a part of the general system, and to be continued from that point towards the ultimate intended termini of the several lines and branches, as new subscrip-

tions continue to be received. The subscribers to these continuations should be entitled to all the privileges and advantages arising from the whole portion of the line already executed from the date of the payment of their respective subscriptions equitably estimated, according to the time when each subscription shall be made.

“3rd, We would farther venture to suggest that the government should undertake either or both of the proposed combined lines on the application of the counties interested; the outlay to be repaid by small instalments, at the lowest admissible rate of interest, and under the provision that in the event of the returns not paying the stipulated amount of interest, the counties shall supply the deficit by presentments.”

The sound doctrine as to the course a government ought to take with regard to works of this character, is, we think, plain enough. They ought not to be rivals of private speculators, who are ready to risk their own money, and to engage their own anxieties, on such undertakings. Instead of discouraging individual enterprise, they ought to use all legitimate means of stimulating it into wholesome activity. With this view they should certainly provide all the facilities recommended by the commissioners, and if need be, go the farther length of making advances of money without any condition whatever of repayment, either in principal or interest. To absolutely *bestow* upon a great national undertaking £25 for every £100 contributed by private undertakers, would, if the work could not be carried to completion by other means, be a proceeding wise in itself, and consistent with every precept of true political economy.

A government may advantageously for the community be the sole operators themselves in a certain case, and accordingly we find the Belgian executive engaged most successfully in extending a system of railways intended to embrace the whole kingdom. They occupy the place of a company of private adventurers, trading no doubt upon the public revenue, but doing so for the public advantage alone. We do not know what better our government could do than imitate their example. That a government must unavoidably be unthrifty superintendants of public works, is a notion we suspect that had better foundation in the good old times of Toryism than at present. No one, perhaps, can as yet say who, in ordinary probability, are to be the occupants of Downing-street for the next five years, or, even the next five months; but every one must know that Downing-street is now penetrable by public opinion, and that all within must bow to its authority. The days of official jobbing are in truth gone by, and every public man, whether a Whig or Conservative be the minister, must, henceforward, be prepared to render an account of his stewardship, even at an hour's warning. We believe there are at

present many official departments in which business is conducted with exemplary care and economy, and we cannot see anything to make us despair of the exercise of similar virtues in the appropriation of a government fund to be dedicated to railroads. There would, to be sure, be something to be feared from the lapses of delegated authority;—the government could only work by subordinate officers;—but is there not the same objection to any plan of operation undertaken by a private company? What is the difference between any set of servants ordinarily appointed for the execution of a given duty by the government, and any set of the usual functionaries selected for the performance of a similar trust by any other body of employers? Of the two authorities indeed—a responsible executive and a scattered body of proprietors,—we think the former have the greater chance of being well and faithfully served. In short, there can be no reasonable objection to a management of railways undertaken by the government; and wherever the result, as far as regards profit, is at all doubtful, their agency ought to be preferred. In the case under consideration, nearly the lowest rate of interest for capital is that which is, according to the commissioners, to be calculated upon for some time. Supposing it should turn out in the end to be only half that interest, and the government were the undertakers, no individual in the whole country could suffer a perceptible injury, and the public at large would have their compensation in the realization of an undoubted national benefit.*

We know with what jealousy many well-meaning Englishmen regard advances of all kinds for the use of Ireland. We have taken occasion already to record the discontent of the representative of an English constituency, who, on hearing of some proposition for the pecuniary accommodation of the Irish parsons, stood up in his place, and protested against the unreasonableness of making England “always a milch cow for Ireland.” The instruction that such politicians receive from the *Quarterly Review* is, that, “articles of British and Foreign produce consumed in Ireland, either pay no tax at all, or taxes considerably lower

* Some interesting calculations have been made by the French engineers as to the advantage to the public, compared with that to the shareholders, arising from the opening of canals. It has been calculated by M. Vallée, principal engineer of the *Canal du Centre*, in France, that if a company executed that canal, that company would only receive, on a comparison of its costs and receipts, 3 per cent. on the sum expended in its construction, whilst France receives by the increase of the national revenue from 12 to 15 per cent. on that undertaking. See an excellent article on *State Labour in Ireland*, published in the last number of the *British and Foreign Review*. To the writer of that article we have reason to know that Ireland is indebted for many tracts of great ability and usefulness.

than those to which they are subject in the sister island ;”—the fact being, that all articles of foreign produce pay exactly the same taxes in both countries, and all articles of British produce, with two or three trifling exceptions.* The *Quarterly Review* besides acquaints these gentlemen, that “rack-rents and tithes are collected in Ireland by a soldiery paid by English taxes;”—the fact being, that all the soldiery in Ireland, and all other servants of the public quartered in that country on the public revenue, are paid out of Irish taxes. The *Times* assures such speculators, that “the whole revenue of Ireland is not able to satisfy the claims of the public creditor who lent his money before the union;”—the fact being, that the said revenue, properly reckoned, is four or five times the alleged amount. And Mr. Coleridge, whose *dicta* on all subjects have been deemed important enough to be put into a book, adds his quota of disparagement, by declaring, that England “never received one particle of advantage from her connexion with Ireland;”—the fact being, that Ireland supplies the English manufacturers with their nearest and best market, to say nothing at all of absentee remittances, of supplies of revenue annually sent to the British exchequer, and of contingents of bone and sinew contributed in time of war. We can hardly wonder at the errors of men having for their guide such “best possible instructors;” and if their very natural prejudices left them in a temper to entertain the claims of Ireland to aid in all shapes, with much greater serenity than ought, under existing circumstances, to be expected, it would be our duty to embrace the present opportunity of endeavouring again to exhibit what England owes Ireland on grounds of *plain retribution*, as well as the most obvious *personal* interest.

It is often said, in general terms, that Ireland has been misgoverned by England, but a few of the details should always be present to the minds of just Englishmen. First of all, Ireland was originally invaded by England, and reduced to English power by a tyranny which made scarcely the least distinction between a native inhabitant and a beast of prey. Secondly, confiscation was carried on from age to age, until eleven-twelfths of the whole territory were transferred from the original possessors, and bestowed upon English adventurers. Even the recognized law of nations was, according to the admission of an obsequious instrument of English power, Lord Clare, violated by this pro-

* Bricks, soap, and post horses, are subject to no duty in Ireland, and Irish whiskey has the benefit of a reduced duty when consumed *at home*. In all other respects the Irish Excise duties are the same as the English. The Customs' duties are without a single exception the same in both countries.

cess, for, agreeably to that law, the inhabitants had a right to the lands enjoyed by them from time immemorial, though the country itself had been attached as a province to the British empire,—a right which would assuredly have been respected “if the wars had been waged against a foreign enemy.”* Thirdly, it was for centuries a settled rule of government, under the English sway, from which there was scarcely ever a departure, that no Irishman, whatever, should enjoy any sort of power or authority in his native country; latterly, the policy was changed into a spoliation and persecution of the many for the benefit of the few. Fourthly, commerce was permitted to the Irish to the extent, and no farther, to which it was not supposed capable of interfering with the trade of England. Lord Strafford, in 1636, made a report to the king and council, of which we have the following description in one of his published letters:—“That there was little or no manufacture among them, but some small beginnings towards a clothing trade, *which I had*, and so should still, *discourage all I could*, unless otherwise directed by his majesty and their lordships; in regard it would trench not; only on the clothing of England, being our staple commodity; so as if they should manufacture their own wool, which grew to very great quantities, we should not only lose the profit we made now by indressing their wools, but his majesty loses extremely by his customs, and, in conclusion, it might be feared they might beat us out of the trade itself by underselling, *in which they were able to do.*” Sir William Temple, in communicating, in 1673, with the Lord Lieutenant on the trade of Ireland, observed that, “regard must be had to those points wherein the trade of Ireland comes to interfere with any main branch of the trade of England, in which case the encouragement of such trade ought to be either declined or moderated, and *so give way to the trade of England.*” In 1698 the English lords presented an address to William the Third, setting forth:—

“That the growing manufacture of cloth in Ireland, both by the cheapness of all sorts of necessaries of life, and the goodness of materials for making all manner of cloth, doth invite his subjects of England, with their families and servants, to leave their habitations to settle there, to the increase of the woollen manufacture in Ireland, which makes his loyal subjects in this kingdom very apprehensive, that the farther growth of it may greatly prejudice the said manufacture here; and praying that his Majesty would be pleased, in the most public and effectual way that may be, to declare to all his subjects of Ireland, that the growth and increase of the woollen manufacture there, hath long, and will be ever, looked upon with great jealousy by all his subjects of this kingdom.”

* Lord Clare's speech delivered on the question of the Union, Feb. 10, 1800.

Shortly after, in the same year, the Commons presented a similar address, and his Majesty's answer was in these words:—

“Gentlemen, I will do all in my power to discourage the woollen manufacture of Ireland.”

His Majesty lost little time in fulfilling his promise, for an act was passed, (10 & 11, W. III, c. 10.), prohibiting the exportation of wool, yarn, new drapery, or old drapery, from Ireland, to any other place but England, on pain of forfeiting ship and cargo, and £500 for every offence; no acquittal in Ireland being allowed to be a bar to a prosecution in England. At this period, the duties upon woollen goods imported from Ireland into England, were, in effect, altogether prohibitory, and the permission to Ireland to export such manufactures to England, was, therefore, a pure mockery.

5. An act in the reign of Anne, permitted Ireland to export clothing and accoutrements to certain regiments in the West Indies, but a subsequent act interdicted the importation of all woollens whatever into these colonies, except they were taken on board in England, subject, of course, to a duty which rendered them prohibited articles.

6. Acts of the 3d and 5th of George I, had for their object the more effectual suppression of the woollen manufactures of Ireland. It being, however, ascertained in the 5th year of George II, that they still found their way into foreign countries, an act was passed, appointing three ships of war of the sixth rate, and eight or more other armed vessels, to cruize off the coast of Ireland, with orders to take or seize all vessels laden with any woollen manufactures from Ireland.

7. By the 9th G. II, c. 12, the importation of glass into Ireland, from any place but England, and the exportation of it to any place whatever, were prohibited on pain of forfeiture of ship and cargo, and a penalty of 10s. for every pound weight of the material on board, or on shore, which penalty was to affect the master and every person aiding or assisting in the work. At this time, kelp, which was the most useful ingredient in the manufacture of crown glass, was supplied to England by Ireland.

8. An act in the same reign declared all hops imported into Ireland, except from Britain, where there was an excessive export duty, should be burned, and the ship landing them forfeited.

9. In the speech of the Lords Justices to the Irish Parliament in 1698, it was noticed, that the woollen manufacture should be suppressed, as being “the settled staple trade of England;” but a pledge was given, of course by the authority of the crown, that

the linen and hempen manufacture should be encouraged "as consistent with the trade of England." In the reigns of George I and II, however, various acts were passed, by which English linens, lawns, cambric, and towelling, were released from the duties of importation in Ireland, it being considered equitable, notwithstanding the pledge of 1698, to make Ireland pay this price for a privilege she received of exporting her linen manufactures directly to the plantations. In the 23d of George II, the Irish Parliament granted certain bounties on the exportation of sail-cloth. This was a measure quite in conformity with the pledge of 1698, yet it was immediately followed by an act, imposing an English import-duty of equal amount; and, afterwards, by another granting a bounty to the English manufacturer on sail-cloth exported to Ireland! William III lived four years after 1698, but never passed one law to redeem the pledge.

10. The 2nd of George II, c. 2, imposed duties on all silk manufactures, except British or East Indian; the 11th, c. 1, imposed duties on all stuffs called Romals, and on all cotton manufactures except British; the 21st, c. 1, prohibited the importation of gold and silver lace, except British; the 23d, c. 2, imposed duties on all velvets except British, and the 33d, c. 1, imposed a duty on all paper except British.

11. The 13th and 14th of George III, imposed a duty of five per cent. on various goods and manufactures, not the growth, produce, or manufacture of Great Britain; another act of the same reign imposed a duty on herrings not British; and another on flour imported, except British. All these acts were productive of disastrous effects upon Irish commerce, especially in the articles of silk, cotton, and paper. It was given in evidence before the Irish Parliament in 1784, that there were eight hundred looms at work in Dublin at the time of the passing of the silk act, and that in thirty-six years afterwards, there were only fifty. An act as late as 1784, subjected gloves, tabinets, silk handkerchiefs, stockings, leather manufactures, printed linens, and an endless variety of articles of Irish fabric, then unequalled in the excellence of their quality, to an export duty of sixty-five per cent., while similar articles of British manufacture were subject to a duty only of ten per cent. It is curious even that the products of the Irish field were subject to a capricious and tyrannical proscription, for there is an act of the English Parliament, which declared the exportation from Ireland of black cattle or sheep "a common nuisance," and prohibited the same "perpetually." There is another which was directed against butter and cheese. And it has been noted, that when England, by

these means, depressed the provision trade of Ireland in the home market, and created a foreign demand, she took care, by an order in council, to lay an embargo on the exportation of Irish provisions, on pretence of "preventing the enemies of Great Britain from being supplied therewith." There are really evidences on record, of a desire to do wholly gratuitous injury to Ireland. Spenser recommended the destruction of the harvests, in order to exterminate the population by hunger. In Boulter's time, the same end was particularly sought, by permitting the French to recruit their armies in Ireland. And there was not shame or decency enough in Sir Joseph Yorke, even in the nineteenth century, to prevent the atrocious avowal, that good would result to the empire, if the victim of six centuries of more than Egyptian oppression, were buried in the abyss of the Atlantic for four-and-twenty hours!

12. There is one other characteristic feature of the English policy, which we should mention under this head. It is well known that Ireland was formerly a very wooded country. A great plenty of wood is favourable to the manufacture of the best description of iron, and, accordingly, in Sir William Petty's time, (about 160 years ago), there were, amongst a population, scarcely the one-seventh of the present, 6,600 forges or smelting houses, or, as he thought, rather one-fifth more.—This having been observed, all encouragement was given to the destruction of the timber, and clauses were introduced into leases granted by the absentee proprietors, requiring the tenants to use nothing for fuel but timber. A scarcity of the article soon ensued, and the Irish Parliament, (10th of William), passed an act to encourage the growth of timber. This act was virtually repealed by a statute of Anne, which remitted certain penalties to such persons as had incurred them under the former law, and had not then paid them. It was formally so by an act of George I, which acknowledged that the penalties of the original statute had not proved effectual.

Some restraint was imposed upon the monopolizing legislation of England by the right to free trade effected in 1779. Her hirelings, however, were still in the Irish executive and the Irish parliament; and they had obtained such sway in 1784, as to negative an amendment to a resolution for an address to the lord-lieutenant, couched in these words:—

"And to entreat his excellency to take into his serious consideration the distressed state of the manufactures of this country, and to assure him of the confidence we place in his wisdom to lay the same fully before his majesty's ministers in England, and co-operate with them in

forming a more liberal arrangement of commercial intercourse between Great Britain and Ireland, on the broad basis of reciprocal advantage."

Such was the commercial policy of England towards Ireland, of which Mr. Pitt gave a pithy and memorable summary in 1785, during the discussion of the commercial propositions, when he said, that the object had been "to render Ireland wholly subservient to the interests and views of Great Britain."* That minister, to be sure, boasted, on the occasion referred to, that there had been a relaxation of this cruel policy, and he affected to be desirous to make the amends more generous and decisive. His reasons for his propositions, however, unfortunately revealed their futility, according to the construction put upon them by Mr. Fox. "The house had been told," said that right honourable gentleman, "that the propositions were such as England might gladly accede to. Why? Because they give Ireland nothing but what it has before. Because Ireland can't rival you. Because Ireland is poor and feeble. And because Ireland must remain so, *if not for ever, at least for a considerable time.*"†

In surveying the past conduct of England to Ireland, it would be leaving out the character of Hamlet in the drama of the Prince of Denmark, to overlook the effects on national wealth of the penal code which doomed the great bulk of the population to poverty and ignorance, prescribing limits to industry, and making education a crime.

We cannot recognize in the Union, on the terms on which it has been effected, or, at least, in the way in which its provisions have been carried out, anything but an aggravation of all former injustice. The Union was not sought for by the Irish people, nor wanted by the Irish people. It was purely the creation of the unfounded fears produced in the mind of the English minister by the successful efforts of the Irish parliament to shake off the more odious and intolerable of the fetters by which it was bound before 1779. Absenteeism, for centuries the bane of Ireland, was confirmed and strengthened in all its powers of producing neglect and working mischief, by the Union. The act of union was, indeed, in one view of it, an act for legalizing and perpetuating absenteeism. The very instincts of the Irish people necessarily recoiled from it, for this and many weighty reasons besides. Never was the repugnance of a nation, according to Lord Grey, more unequivocally and emphatically expressed, than was that of the Irish people to this act. Seven hundred and seven thousand men, out of an adult population whose total could not be 900,000, petitioned against it, and only 3000 for it, many of

* Stockdale's Debates, vol. i. p. 289.

† Ibid. 302.

whom only prayed that the measure should be considered.* Twenty-seven was the number of the counties engaged in active resistance. Dublin and all the towns of the least importance co-operated. Of 300 men professing to be the representatives of the people, 120 strenuously opposed the measure. The majority was composed of a band of which 116 were placemen, including generals on the staff, without one foot of land in Ireland. To make up this majority, means were resorted to unheard of in the annals of parliament; for not only were recusant members, without one exception, deprived of all employments they happened to hold, but the surrender of sixty-three seats was effected between one session and another. "In fact," said Lord Grey, "the nation is nearly unanimous, and this great majority is composed, not of fanatics, bigots, or jacobins, but of the most respectable of every class in the community."

The terms of an incorporation effected under these circumstances, if not generous, should, at least, have been equitable. This was declared in all forms of speech in 1800; and if we look into the articles of the "treaty," as it is called, we shall find many instances in which the deed was reconciled with the profession. No one fairly construing its stipulations, can, for example, allege, that in the great concern of taxation, they proposed any course inconsistent with justice or fair dealing. They laid down two fundamental principles for the government of the exchequer:—*indemnity* (as it may be termed) for the past, and *security* for the future; indemnity applying to all the pecuniary responsibilities incurred previously to the incorporation; and security, giving a guarantee that such portion of the future responsibilities as might fall upon the weaker country, should be scrupulously proportioned to her resources. What were the past responsibilities in 1800? Ireland's share was £26,000,000, and Great Britain's £420,000,000; one demanding an annual separate payment of one million, and the other an annual separate payment (let us say, for the sake of round numbers) of sixteen millions. The question cannot now arise, whether Ireland was fairly called upon before 1800 to pay any portion of the British debt. Such a topic was not even glanced at during the discussions upon the "treaty;"† and if it were, it could easily have been disposed of by a reference to those ages of oppression and plunder which were delicately called "times of subserviency to the interests and views of Britain," by Mr. Pitt, and to the law of England, which entitled even well-governed and tenderly cherished colo-

* Lord Grey's speech, Parliamentary History, vol. xxxv. pp. 57 to 72.

† An Act of the 18th of George the Third.

nies to the application of their revenues to their own uses. But the matter was not made the subject even of a whisper during a debate; and, at all events, the "treaty" binds England to a separate levy of taxes for the payment of her own debt, amounting to £420,000,000. Is there now a separate taxation for that purpose? It should amount to £16,000,000 a-year: is Britain subjected to a separate taxation to that extent? Certainly not, or to one-half its amount. The British window tax is now reduced to £1,258,000 a-year; the servant tax to £201,000; the carriage tax to £441,000; the post-horse tax to £222,000; and the whole of the assessed taxes to about £2,800,000. The brick and soap taxes produce £968,000. There is a land tax, but some set-off for it is to be found in the revenues still raised in Ireland by the Commissioners of Woods and Forests, or the produce of their sales, which has been converted altogether to British purposes. The duty on a gallon of gin is higher than that on a gallon of whiskey, and there are some small inequalities in stamps. Putting all items together, they may reach to £6,000,000; but the "treaty" pledged Britain to £16,000,000 of separate taxation. How was it released from this engagement? How *could* it be released by any means intelligible to common sense or reconcilable to common honesty, but by a sweeping away of the £420,000,000, every shilling of which is now as settled an incumbrance on the industry of the people as it was in 1800. Without a union, Ireland had no participation in the liability of the English debt; with a union, she has share and share alike in that debt. The difference to her is, that she must contribute to the raising of a revenue of £16,000,000, to which she was formerly obliged to make no contribution. In 1800, the standard of her taxation was, in all respects, lower than that of Britain. To enable her to meet the new incumbrance imposed upon her, it was necessary to assimilate her taxes to those of Britain in the whole of the customs, and, with two or three small exceptions, in the whole of the excise. Does this bear on the face of it the semblance of fairness? No matter what the treasury contrivances may be called, could Ireland, we ask, have been free from the responsibilities of £420,000,000 of debt in one year, and involved in the entire mass of them in fifteen years afterwards, by any instrumentality but foul play?

We have already entered into this subject in considerable detail;* but as every year produces new thinkers, and adds, we rejoice to say, to the number of those upright Englishmen who sincerely sympathize in the misfortunes of Ireland, a short summary is advisable on every occasion.

* Dublin Review, vol. i. Art. "State and Prospects of Ireland."

When the incorporation was proposed, there was the great inequality stated between the two debts. Taxes are required for the liquidation of debts; and as the debts in question were enormously disproportioned, no equalization of taxes could have been thought of at the time of the "treaty." But it might be otherwise at a future period. The debts might be liquidated, or rendered more equal. How could they be rendered more equal? By the reduction of the larger, or an inordinate augmentation of the smaller. How could such an augmentation of the smaller be effected, if the stipulations of the "treaty," which guaranteed a contribution proportioned to relative ability, were observed? It was utterly impossible that the Irish debt could have increased in a disproportionate degree, unless, in violation of the engagements of the "treaty," she were overburthened with fiscal obligation. Then, increase of the Irish debt could not bring about the equalization contemplated. Nothing to produce it had arisen from the liquidation of the greater debt, for it did remain, and does still remain, wholly undiminished. It follows, by necessary and unavoidable consequence, that there could be no just union of the debts, or equalization of taxes, on any one of the commodities yielding revenue in Ireland.

There were two exchequers in 1800, rendered necessary by the inequality of the debts. They were united in 1816; and if one were to go into Downing-street to ask the explanation, he would be told that it was most true that Ireland owed less in the former year than Britain; that less, consequently, was demanded of her in taxation; but that things were altered by the great increase of the Irish debt; and that, at all events, Ireland has no substantial cause to complain, for she is not called upon to pay more under the new arrangement than the old.

Let us test this, taking for our guide the transactions of the past year. We will assume that the whole expenditure was £46,000,000. Of this, £28,000,000 were for debt, and £17,000,000 for the responsibilities incurred before the union; the joint expenditure, therefore, was £29,000,000. Now, to this, in virtue of the "treaty," Ireland was bound to contribute in proportion to her means. What were her means? The surest criterion is furnished by those receipts of revenue, under heads in which there is a perfect equality between the two countries. They were as follows, in the past year:—

		British.	Irish.
Customs	- -	£20,713,000	2,014,000
Excise	- -	8,230,000	461,000
Post Office	-	2,246,000	283,000
		<hr/>	<hr/>
		31,189,000	2,758,000
			2 N 2

There were undoubtedly receipts credited as British, which were in reality Irish, and we are justifiable in deducting, probably, £300,000 from the first of these totals, and adding it to the second; making the former £30,889,000, and the latter, £3,058,000.* These amounts are in the proportion of about one to ten; and there can be little doubt that such was the ratio in the by-gone year, of Ireland's means to the British. The joint expenditure, we have said, was £29,000,000. Ireland's share would, in virtue of the "treaty," have been a tenth, or £2,900,000, besides £1,000,000 for separate debt. Even in this view of affairs, there would have been a considerable surplus; for adding the £300,000 to which we have adverted, to the acknowledged "payments into the exchequer," there was a total available revenue of £4,300,000; and if the revenue had been much larger, there would have been a result to Ireland proportionably advantageous.†

It is mere stupidity, then, or downright fraud, to allege that it is the same to Ireland whether there had been a consolidation of the exchequers or not. Surely it will be admitted, that a great augmentation of the Irish revenue was, and is, a very probable event; unless, indeed, that English injustice, by contrivances not heard of even in the days of Mr. Pitt's "subserviency," can succeed in drying up all possible sources of increase. The Scotch revenue in 1801 was £1,985,000, and it is now above £5,000,000. Why should not the Irish revenue increase as much as the Scotch? It is curious that its augmentation since 1801 has been only from £3,560,000 (net receipts) to £4,476,000. But if the destinies had permitted an increase equal to the Scotch, it would be now about a sixth of the whole revenue; an amount which, in the present year, would leave Ireland, under the stipulations of the "treaty," *more than £3,000,000 of surplus, applicable to her own uses*; and let it be always borne in mind, that the framers of the act of union assumed that *five millions* might be applicable to the uses of Ireland,—to the liquidation of her debt, the reduction of her taxes, or the improvement of her internal condition.

This subject ought to be agitated in Parliament, if it were for no other purpose than to remove the delusions which exist in the minds of the most intelligent public men, as to the real state of

* £300,000 is Sir Henry Parnell's estimate of the "Duties paid in England on foreign articles exported from thence to Ireland." We cannot now claim much for tea duties, for they were credited last year to the extent of £409,000, to the Irish Customs' revenue.

† The Irish payments into the exchequer were a quarter of a million lower in the last than the preceding year, and last year, therefore, is an unfavourable one for our calculation.

the pecuniary account between Great Britain and Ireland. The consolidation of the Exchequers was not an unavoidable act; it was not treated as such by Lord Castlereagh, who said that something should be done, and that the question was, whether uniting the debts and the Exchequers was not better than any other course that could be adopted? That it was the worst course for Ireland is, we think, established beyond all possibility of doubt, by the case we have stated, but whether it led to any practical consequence of an injurious nature, it is due to Ireland that the facts should be known in Parliament, and the deductions arising from them subjected to the most searching scrutiny. The belief now is, that England has made extraordinary pecuniary sacrifices for Ireland. There is not, probably, a single English or Scotch member who is not thoroughly impressed with this conviction. Must it not tend to the advantage of Ireland, to have the real state of the case ascertained? Even Sir Henry Parnell has persuaded himself, that Ireland is a "burthen to England." What harm would it do to Ireland if he were put upon his proofs in open Parliament? Miserable, indeed, is the revenue of Ireland, but it is, according to his own estimate of it, £4,000,000, and, admitting that all the troops in Ireland are necessary for the security of Ireland, and that there is a peculiar obligation on Ireland to provide for their maintenance, still there is something left for Imperial objects; for, putting the expenses for army, and for constabulary, and for civil government, and for pensions, and for charities, and for public works, together, they do not exceed the total of £2,000,000, and the acknowledged payments into the Exchequer in the last year, were £4,000,000, exclusive of the credit of £300,000, which we have claimed and allowed for in the foregoing estimate. Then the country which is "burthensome" to England, has, at any rate, £3,000,000 a-year to be devoted to Imperial purposes. The two debts are now one, and the public are also told, that both have been "placed by England on her own shoulders." Suppose Ireland was left her own peculiar share, that incurred under the sanction of her own Parliament, is there not a million of her own revenue to be dedicated to its uses, and is there not still more than a million left for Imperial purposes, notwithstanding the support out of her taxes of half the army kept standing in the British islands?—troops, by the way, as conveniently situated in Ireland for merely British purposes, as if they were located within her own territory; in proof of which, we need only refer to the detachments sent from Dublin to quell the Nottingham and Bristol riots. By the Parliamentary paper to which we have already directed the atten-

tion of our readers,* it appears, that there were remittances between the English and Irish Exchequers, from 1796 to 1833, amounting in the sum received *from* Ireland, to £19,640,000, and the sum received *by* Ireland, £8,251,000, which left a balance of £11,389,000 in favour of England. There was no great "burthen" in receiving this, and it was not all that England received, for it did not include upwards of £2,500,000 remitted to the Woods and Forests, or one fraction of "those duties paid in England," according to Sir Henry Parnell, "as foreign articles exported from thence to Ireland." The tea tax of Ireland was, for many years, paid altogether in London, and the remittances *eastwards*, did not, of course, include any part of its amount. Neither did it include one shilling of the absentee remittances, which, in the interval of thirty years, must have amounted to £70 or £80,000,000.† But, then, it will be said, that there was interest of debt to be paid in London for Ireland. Yes, but our argument is, that the principal portion of the debt was unfairly and irregularly contracted; that this portion was, of right, *British* debt; that, at all events, any debt incurred in the name of Ireland, was for Imperial purposes, and that large balances of Irish revenue were left to be applied to its purposes, though we verily believe, that there are in the House of Commons even many Irish members who credit the story, that England took all the debt "on her own shoulders," and that there is not a farthing of its interest which is not paid out of British taxes.—Something, surely, ought to be done, to undeceive at least those gentlemen who undertake the guardianship of the Irish interests in Parliament.

There is so little known, even amongst Irishmen themselves, of the financial affairs of their country, that we may mention it as *news*, that a considerable portion of the interest of that debt taken by England on her own shoulders," is paid directly out of Irish taxes, and on Irish ground. Notwithstanding the "consolidation," there is a distinction still made between the British and Irish debt, the latter being set down at £33,417,000. The interest of this debt is paid out of the Irish revenue in Dublin, and it amounted in the last year to £1,183,000. Now, if any Irish member think proper to move for the necessary papers, he will find, that that amount of interest, and the army serving in Ireland, and the Lord Lieutenants' establishment, and the judges, and the constabulary, and the pensioners, and all other state

* Vol. ii. p. 304.

† Mr. Puget was able to assert, in 1804, from the transactions of his own house, that the absentee remittances were then £2,000,000 annually. These are now supposed to be £3,500.

claimants, were paid out of the Irish taxes, and that there was a surplus of at least £1,000,000 remitted to the English Treasury, to take no account at all of the Irish revenue which was collected in English ports, or the absentee remittances. If he extend his inquiries, he will be able to elicit a fact that must be somewhat startling to the readers of *The Times*, the *Quarterly Review*, and Coleridge, as being little dreamt of in their philosophy, namely, that Ireland never got any thing from England but blows,* that all the money ever expended upon her was her own, and that if she now sues, *in formâ pauperis*, for a sum to be expended in the encouragement of railways, her requests go no farther than seeking that there may be less taken from her than her rich neighbour has been accustomed to take, unintentionally and unknowingly we are free to admit, and through the effect entirely of an Exchequer machinery, whose workings are not only unexamined, but unobserved.

We flatter ourselves we have made it abundantly clear that a large pecuniary help is due to Ireland, and that a fair construction of the articles of the Union would give her a right to demand it *ex debito justitiæ*; but we are satisfied to rest her case solely on the manifest advantages which England herself must reap from the developement of the Irish resources. In 1825 the value of the imports from Great Britain was £7,048,000; it is now, doubtless, 8 or 9,000,000; but it may in no very great lapse of years be raised to £20,000,000. At the time of the Scotch Union its revenue was only £120,000 a year. The Irish revenue must have been three times that amount at the period, for according to the parliamentary papers ordered 20th of June, 1827, it was £440,536 in 1720, yet it is now under the public income of Scotland.† The Irish revenue is quite capable of being raised to triple its present amount; and to produce a considerable approach to such a result nothing more seems to be needed than a liberal outlay on public works, if we are to judge by effects already produced in various parts of the country. Mr. Williams stated before the Committee on Public Works, in 1835, that by the expenditure of £170,000 on public works in Connaught, in seven years, an *annual* increase of revenue of equal amount has been produced. In Cork £50,000 a year has been realized by an outlay in seven years of £60,000. This

* It is curious to observe the extent to which even Cromwell made Ireland tributary to the dominant country. His "compositions with Irish delinquents" produced £1,000,000, and his sale of Irish lands £1,320,000, both which sums were deposited in the English Treasury, "debentures" and plunder, sufficing to defray the entire expenses of his Irish wars.

† In 1832 the Scotch revenue was £5,113,853, and the Irish £4,292,445. (Paper ordered 27th of February, 1832.)

is to be attributed mainly to “the facilities of communication by which whole districts have been rendered available for productive purposes, and a miserable population converted into a class of consumers.” The moral effects of a comparatively insignificant expenditure are equally striking. Mr. Griffith gives the following description of a district in Cork, Limerick, and Kerry, which was either wholly desolate some years ago, or a retreat merely for whiteboys, smugglers, and robbers:—

“A very considerable improvement has already taken place in the vicinity of the roads, both in the industry of the inhabitants and the appearance of the country; upwards of sixty new lime kilns have been built; carts, ploughs, harrows, and improved implements, have become common; new houses of a better class have been built, new inclosures made, and the country has become perfectly tranquil, and exhibits a scene of industry and exertion at once pleasing and remarkable. A large portion of the money received for labour has been husbanded with care, laid out in the building of substantial houses, and in the produce of stock and agricultural implements; and numerous examples might be shown of labourers possessing neither money, houses, nor land, when first employed, who, in the past year, have been enabled to take farms, build houses, and stock their land.”

We would earnestly direct the attention of our public men to a consideration which has been too little regarded in the modern speculations upon Ireland. In the times of the Liverpools and Vansittarts, “transition from war to peace” was the unraveller of every perplexity. It explained much as regarded England, but it had not there any importance comparable to what it had, and has, in Ireland. Ireland is a country wasted by absentees, and which has now a drain to the English exchequer even of its public revenue. Previous to the union its parliament was in itself such a check upon absenteeism, that the evil was supposed to have been immensely aggravated before the closing of the first year succeeding the event, and there was no permanent drain of public revenue. The years subsequent to the union, and following on to the close of the war, were well calculated to make considerable reparation for the new money demands, for they were not only times of high prices, but of enormous army and other expenditure. During a very considerable period the army payments averaged between 3 and £4,000,000 annually, and they are now below £1,000,000. In all other respects there is a greatly reduced expenditure, and most unsuitably to such a condition of affairs, there has been a continuous effort to “assimilate” Irish to English taxation, and a consequent denial to Ireland of the remission of burdens which the “transition” state so imperatively demands. Under all these circumstances there can be

no difficulty in seeing the necessity of something new, and on a comprehensive scale, to put Ireland in a position of real prosperity. To the efficacy of public works all experience bears triumphant testimony, and there is no sum demanded for their use that cannot be expended in Ireland far better for the purposes of Britain herself than in any part of her own territory.

One word in conclusion on the Railway Report. It is manifestly the work of different hands, each commissioner having undertaken the execution of that division of it for which he was best fitted; it is on this account the more valuable and perfect in all its parts. Indeed, it has left nothing unsaid, or which is not well said, on the multifarious topics embraced in its ample and voluminous pages.

ART. X.—1. *Father Clement*; a Roman Catholic Story. Third Edition. Edinburgh. 1825.

2. *The Nun*. London. 1836.

3. *The Roman Catholic Chapel; or, Lindenhurst Parish*. By Rosina Zornlin. London. 1837.

4. *Geraldine; a Tale of Conscience*. Second Edition. London. 1838.

5. *Alton Park; the Prize Book*. Mrs. Herbert. 1837.

6. *Father Rowland; a Catholic Tale of North America*. Dublin. 1837.

WE have here an assemblage of works which, to the thinking mind, may seem to belong to the lighter and more trifling literature of the day; being all works of fiction, in other words—*novels*. In another point of view they are of infinite importance, for here we have controversy in its most insinuating form. Disputes upon subjects in which our eternal happiness is involved escape from the responsibility incurred by the learned theological treatise; and under the modest shelter of the marble-papered half-binding, are instilled principles into young minds, who eagerly, and with a sense of self-approval, read what they consider as in some degree religious works. Extremes are said to meet, and it is astonishing how often this trite remark, when tested, is found to be correct. In earlier ages, and in half-civilized nations, fables, poems, and tales, were not only the vehicles of amusement, but the recognized and customary channels of information; and now, at a period of so much intelligence, we seem fast returning to the old method. Science in every branch is conveyed by fiction; not only the tone

of society, but national manners and morals, history, political economy, and religion, all are introduced into novels, are discussed with more or less—frequently with the very highest—ability; most of these subjects, we have no doubt, receiving so much increased interest and clearness as must fully compensate for occasional errors. In most instances these works must have stimulated their readers to farther inquiry, and where they have failed to do so, the consequences to the incurious mind, of some erroneous impressions, can seldom be of great importance.

Religious novels alone we consider an exception to what we have said; in religion all errors are dangerous, all may become fatal; whether we are led to adopt wrong opinions, or attribute them to others, there is danger of a host of evils, of which bigotry, rash judgment, and injustice, frightful as they are, may not be the most considerable; and the religious novelist has powers of mischief at his disposal, which, skilfully worked, are almost incalculable;—he constructs an interesting story—its perplexities and moral involvements turning altogether upon religious tenets and practices, until the awful consequences of these supposed opinions have been so clearly delineated, and placed in so many points of view, that they become *facts* to the mind of the reader, and the chances are greatly against his enquiring into the *truth* of the ground-work of these hypotheses. The characters too are made interesting, such as the young mind loves to dwell upon; they are placed in situations of persecution, always for “righteousness’ sake;” garbled quotations are introduced, sweeping assertions made, and assumed to be proved. In the blindest language of charity the foulest charges are insinuated; where absolute falsehood may not be ventured on, the truth is distorted, a web of deception is woven inextricable by the ignorant, who are then tenderly invited to “compassionate” those, whom the writer has spared neither skill nor pains to render odious. Add to this a specious preface, disclaiming all harsh feelings, grieving for the necessity of thus warning the public against our “deluded fellow-countrymen,” or our “unhappy brethren,” as the case may be; but hinting that from tenderness to these brethren, as well as from a regard to “the morals of society,” not half has been published of what the author could have told,—and we have an engine of mischief, swift and subtle in its operation, and most difficult to counteract.

We propose to give a short analysis of three specimens of this class, and to contrast them with some Catholic works written in the same form,—but in how different a spirit! and principally with *Geraldine*, the work of a late convert to our holy religion, who, casting aside falsehood and melodramatic horrors, with

truth and her own bright spirit to aid her, has written a clear and full exposition of our faith, a keen attack upon that of our adversaries, not clothed in honied words, but influenced by the primary and most essential charity of strict truth and justice, which would endure the closest examination; and all this so skillfully arranged, as never to become wearisome; and gracefully spirited in language, narrative, and delineation of character. Would that the high and holy duties to which this lady has devoted herself may not prevent her favouring us again. She may rest assured that such works as hers are of essential service to religion, and in a way much needed.

We will begin with *Father Clement*, a work published in Edinburgh, 1825, and now going, we believe, into its fourth edition. We are not surprised at this, for the story is not only the most insidious in controversy of any of its class, but has considerable merit as a composition, and is written in an easy and persuasive style. The plan of the story is the very common one of a Catholic and a Protestant family residing near, and thrown into communication with each other. It is a matter of course that the strict Catholics should be ignorant, bigotted, and unamiable; that the enquirers should be praiseworthy, and that human virtue should reach its perfection in the different members of the Protestant family:—neither do we complain that the Catholics are invariably unable to make any, or only the most contemptible defence of their doctrines—it is not, perhaps, to be expected, in a work of this kind, that the adversaries' case should be strongly stated; but then these passive disputants should not be made to assent in the name of their Church to opinions which that Church disclaims;—whether this, or any other rule of justice has been observed, we shall see as we go on. The story opens with the return of Clarenham, the heir of the Catholic family, who has been educated abroad, and of the Jesuit by whom he has been educated, and who is now to replace the old domestic chaplain: the young people visit, and the controversy begins in the same style as it is to continue: the Protestant observing, “I am led to believe that the members of your communion carefully avoid free discussion on the subject of religion,”* and the Catholic admitting “that the subjects which must make part of our confessions afterwards are naturally avoided by us;”† and that, “our spiritual fathers must narrowly examine us respecting our intercourse with heretics.”

We suspect that many Protestants will be greatly surprised by the first of these propositions, and would be not a little relieved

from their alarms, could they believe it true; nor would our clergy be particularly grateful for the large addition to their duties contained in the second, *if true*. Then follows a specimen of argument. “Surely,” says Clarenham, “we do not err in bestowing whatever we can command that is most perfect in ornamenting the temple of God.” “Perhaps not,” says the Protestant, “BUT those living stones which alone compose the true temple of God, must be sculptured by a divine power to make that temple a fit abode for Him.”* Very true—but positively no answer: scripture would instruct him, that while the greater things are attended to, the lesser are not to be left undone. “What are our most perfect sculptures or ornaments to Him who looks only on the heart?”† What were they when the temple was built under his especial direction? A great deal of bad and sophistical argument follows upon the hackneyed subject of praying to the saints, and paying respect to pictures, &c., with which we cannot think of troubling our readers; but after this skirmishing, the principal and most appalling charge is introduced. A Protestant quotes a text from Scripture, in the presence of some Catholic young ladies and their mother, and is immediately interrupted by the priest with,—“quote in *Latin* if you please Mr. Montague;”‡ and thence-forward, upon this subject, the whole armoury of falsehood is exhausted. We were here reminded of a remark of Dr. Wiseman’s, who says, that in all histories of Protestant conversions, the parties converted are, in fact, Protestants at the outset, who, thinking that they do not find in the Bible, (of which they always by some marvellous chance become possessed), all the practices of the Church, are instantly convinced that the Church is wrong; the REAL dispute between the parties as to the all-sufficiency of the Bible being taken for granted; so here—that the Bible contains all the truth, and is the *only* rule of faith, is not only asserted by the Protestants, which might fairly be done,—but Catholics are represented as conceding the point, and holding it equally with them. Not only the grounds of the Catholic doctrine upon this point are not given, but the fact that such a different doctrine is held at all is carefully kept out of sight, lest it should awaken an inquiry into what might be said in its defence. The injustice of this concealment is manifest, and it is evidently intentional, for great is the use made of it throughout. “Why do you withhold the Scriptures from your people?” says the Protestant to the Catholic priest, in a sort of stop-thief tone of inquiry. The unhappy man neither denies the charge nor attempts a justification, but hangs his head in guilty

dejection:—he attempts a remonstrance to his people—“The Bible does not say so,” says the young lady, and he is forthwith silenced; he recommends a devotional practice,—“I cannot find it in the Bible,” says the Protestant—and lo! he vanishes with a sorrowful growl. Well he might, were their statements true; for it is a wonderful circumstance, that every verse and word, nay, we are half led to suppose, even the very out-side binding of the book—contain conviction upon this long disputed subject. “Read the Bible,” says the Protestant Dr. Lowther to his convert—and, as she reads, a cloud disappears—Protestantism is written in each line, Catholicism is loudly stigmatized in every verse; that learned and pious and disinterested Catholics should have read and meditated upon this very Bible, and yet have continued Catholics, is evidently a fact to be kept out of sight; it must not be dwelt upon, it must not be even noticed;—but lest, in spite of all precaution, some inquiring mind should be tempted to investigation by this circumstance, they meet the difficulty by denying at once that Catholics ever read the Bible at all, going so far as to assert, *that priests are never permitted to read it till after they have taken an oath to uphold every word of it in the sense that the Church teaches.** For this monstrous assertion there is not, as may well be believed, one shadow of proof, or even of what might have been supposed such—not a reference—not an authority, good or bad. Shall we attribute this to ignorance? No—undesigning ignorance is seldom so circumstantial: it is in truth, and the author knew that it was so while writing it, “a good sound Protestant lie,” invented for the purpose of hiding from the more candid of their communion a fact which might startle them. The difficulty with respect to conscientious priests being thus disposed of, the laity are more easily dealt with; thunderbolts and portents could scarcely amaze them more than the sight of a Bible. It is only now and then and by stealth, that one ray of scriptural truth can ever reach them. Alas! all this nonsense will be believed. In vain do Catholics deny the prohibition,—in vain do they show their Bibles, and quote from them,—in vain have lists been made of the countless editions of the Bible that have been published—authorized by the Church—and which, (as Catholic booksellers are not made of different materials from other tradesmen), must, it is to be presumed, have found purchasers. The assertion is still repeated,—the stone we are rolling up hill is thrown back upon our feet, till we know not whether to mourn or to laugh at this perversity. A thought strikes us;—we have a resource in the

Missal; the Popish Mass Book—the head and front of our offending—they will surely allow us to have undisputed possession of; and if they agree to this, will they not admit that some gleams of light may have reached us, through the portions of Scripture it contains, being no less than—Of the Gospel of St. Matthew, 701 verses; St. Mark, 189; St. Luke, 1521; St. John, 1124; Of the Acts, 184; Of the Epistle to the Romans, 82; 1 Corinthians, 130; 2 Corinthians, 88; Galatians, 59; Ephesians, 49; Phillipians, 34; Colossians, 14; 1 Thessolonians, 36; 2 Thessolonians, 8; 1 Timothy, 29; 2 Timothy, 14; Titus, 15; Hebrews, 59; Epistle of St. James, 29; 1 Epistle of St. John, 16; 1 Epistle of St. Peter, 62; making a total of 4,438 verses from the Gospels and Epistles only; besides the Introits, Offer-tories, and other parts of the service, which are almost wholly taken from Scripture: nor have we cited the large extracts from the Old Testament contained in the Missal alone; had we gone on to quote the portions of Scripture which are introduced into the Service of Vespers—for the dead—for the Holy Week, and others that are in the hands of every Catholic, the quantity of Holy Writ which *must* be read by every Catholic who can read at all, would really surprise Protestants, and might well exonerate the Church from the charge of concealment.

But no! setting facts, probabilities, and the booksellers' shops alike at defiance, they would doubtless tell us, then, that we could not read the missal. An assertion still more offensive they *do* make, in the book we are reviewing, namely, that we must not (or do not) pray except in Latin. The Jesuit says a long Latin grace, Maria (the convert to Protestantism) *ventures* to thank God in her own language. "Precious English prayers," says the same person,—“how different from those with which our priests guide our devotions!” And when describing her progress in Protestantism, she says:—“I do attend chapel; but when Father Adrian repeats what I do not understand, I attempt to pray to God in my heart; for it is the heart God regards.” And again, “Maria turned away, and stood with her face from her till she had repeated the remaining prayers, not one of which she understood.”—p. 250.

But the peculiarity of this book is in the character of two Jesuits, the tutor of young Clarenham, and the provincial of the order in England. The latter is merely a personification of the old calumnies against the order; a wily, ambitious, arrogant, bad man; but the former is drawn with much skill, and a most insidious affectation of candour; he is made truly devout and amiable, and is then placed in such situations, that his conscience of necessity rebels against the (supposed) dictates of his Church:

by continual effort he struggles to subdue his sense of right, and the conflict ends in his conversion and his death. Upon the first suspicion that young Clarenham is imbibing the principles of Protestantism, Warrenne (the superior Jesuit) persuades him to go abroad upon a secret mission connected with the restoration of the Stuarts, and then throws him into the dungeons of the Inquisition; while his tutor, mourning over this outrage, witnessing the distress of his widowed mother and his family, and able, by a single word, to oblige Warrenne to produce him, is bound by his vow of obedience to conceal, nay, to co-operate with, the evil designs of his superior. Here is one of the artifices we alluded to at the commencement of our article; a *situation* is invented, with just plausibility enough the better to deceive; the baseness on the one hand, the suffering on the other, are powerfully drawn; they awaken the passions and feelings of the young; they fix themselves upon the memory; and a young person contracts an abhorrence of a set of men and of opinions, which in after years he will imagine to have arisen from his own unbiassed reason. One word would demolish the whole fabric of falsehood, but will that word ever reach them? Would that it might! and that they would receive our pledge, that there is no oath, no vow, no conceivable tie, that can bind a Catholic to do evil. When he takes a vow of obedience to a superior, he makes that superior the master of his time, talents, and wealth; and in all matters not decided by a higher power, he submits to him his freedom in action, and his right of private judgment; that is, he gives him for life that authority, which is temporarily exercised by a father over his child, by a master over his pupil, by the father of a family over his household, by an officer over his soldiers, by the captain of a ship over his seamen: in all these instances, for the sake of subordination and effective service, men give up their liberty as absolutely as is the case in any of the monastic orders—more absolutely than in most;—but in both cases there is a double check upon that authority: in the first place, of an appeal to a superior temporal power; and lastly, to that divine command and authority which both parties recognize, and which has formed the basis of the contract. That a monk should hold himself obliged to do anything contrary to the love of God, who has given up his freedom for the love of God only, is absurd: a Jesuit may be commanded by his superior to leave all the comforts he is enjoying, and, at a few hours' notice, to go to martyrdom in China; but his superior cannot command him to give up his faith, the faith which they both profess, and in virtue of which alone he is his superior; he cannot blot from the catechism by which both are alike

bound, the simple and primary law, that *a man shall not commit sin for the love or fear of anything whatsoever* :* in conclusion, a situation such as this, in which a priest could hold himself bound in conscience to break the law of God, at the command of a superior, could never have existed.

The Jesuit is then represented as dying ; and now is brought to a climax all the mystification between good works, and justification by faith, which is kept up from the beginning of the book, and which is so great, that not only Protestants could not learn our real faith from it, but we ourselves might find some difficulty in detecting the truth amidst the maze of insinuations, mixtures of truth and falsehood, doctrines that are correct, and consequences that are *not* correct either in fact or in logic, and such like small arts, for darkening the truth with a cloud of words ; but there is no mistaking the tendency of such passages as the following :—

“ Thus far Protestants and Catholics, if really the children of God, are of one mind : but, in the solving of that most important of all questions—How is that favour to be obtained ? or rather—How are apostate, fallen creatures to be restored to that favour ? their difference of opinion becomes almost irreconcilable. Thus far Dormer felt and believed, as every child of God at some period of his progress does ; but at this point he became entirely Roman Catholic, and suffered much of what is frequently suffered by sincerely pious Roman Catholics, while labouring, as it were, ‘ in the very fire,’ to *merit* that favour which Protestants, at least truly pious Protestants, believe is bestowed only through the merits of Him who took the nature of fallen man, that He might, in that nature, and in the place of fallen man, fulfil that law men cannot fulfil, and ‘ bring in for men an everlasting righteousness.’ This was not a doctrine taught by Dormer’s Church ; and if, at any time, the comfort it was calculated to convey to a mind agonizing under a sense of sin, flashed upon his, he would reject it as unauthorized by his Church, and as a temptation of the enemy of his soul to lure him from the path of self-denial. *His* Church taught, that it was in the power of fallen man himself to merit favour from God. She taught, that good works, done for the love of Jesus Christ, are available for the remission of sins—that they obtain from God an increase of grace in this life, and the reward of everlasting happiness hereafter. What those good works were, she also taught. Fasts, penances, mortifications, repetitions of prayers ;—such were the works by which Dormer hoped to attain to everlasting life.”—pp. 181-183. * * *

“ ‘ In what, then, my dear Sir, do you find a refuge from despair ?’

“ ‘ ‘Tis strange,’ replied Dormer, ‘ how, at such moments, one doctrine of our faith stands forth so as to throw all the others into distance and insignificance. The vastness of that sense of want felt by the soul, seems instinctively to cling to the infinite vastness of the means appointed by God to supply it. The death of the Son of God seems alone

* See *Primary Catechism*.

sufficient to blot out sins so aggravated and innumerable :—the righteousness of the Son of God alone so spotless as to answer the demands of the perfect law of God. Christ is seen to have wrought the work alone,—and then the soul asks—for whom was it wrought? For man,—for all men,—for whosoever will : and for a time, a glorious triumphant moment, the soul forgets all but its Almighty Saviour and its own safety.” —pp. 330, 331.

We have given instances of false argument and of false assertion ; let us now unravel this piece of sophistication (which is but a specimen of many others) and our case against this work will be complete. The Church does *not* teach that good works obtain for us the “reward of eternal happiness hereafter ;” all the good works of all created men were powerless, even to save us from punishment, much less to obtain happiness. Heaven and its blessings have been purchased for us by the passion and death of our Lord Jesus, of his own free, unmerited and boundless mercy—but she *does* teach us that when having redeemed us by his blood, and cleansed us by his sacraments (deriving all their efficacy from his precious blood), and of his free-grace having brought us into his Church and into his covenant, *then* God is pleased, still of his own free-grace, to promise to reward us in proportion as we labour for his sake. These doctrines are clear and openly avowed—let Protestants confute them, but let them not so misstate them as to leave an impression that the Catholic trusts in his own meritorious works alone, for salvation. It is true that the Church commends prayer and mortification as eminent good works, but why in the catalogue leave out the equally essential, and as strongly inculcated, duties of charity, both corporal and spiritual? Was it, perchance, lest the mention of these might awaken some sympathy in Protestant bosoms to their Catholic brethren? And lastly, why have they dared, having raised a superstructure of falsehood, by means so infamous, to crown it with the portrait of a Catholic priest, ignorant of the theory of his redemption, desponding for his soul’s welfare, and only “strangely,” and, as it were, by chance, remembering that his Saviour died for him!! The Catholic priest! who may be said of all men to have *loved most*, and to have his life hidden with Jesus—labouring for his glory, trusting in his strength, finding in his love his only comfort in this life, his only support against daily insult and contumely—well may he trust to that love for his happiness hereafter, for there is no man that hath left house, or parents, or brethren, or wife, or children, for the kingdom of God’s sake (and he has left them all) who shall not receive much more in this present time, and in the world to come life everlasting.

The next upon our list is the story of a young lady, who having entered a convent, she did not very well know why, becomes, as was natural, very soon tired of the life they lead there, escapes from its walls during a popular tumult, and thus provides herself with a Bible—and a husband. This is simply the thread of the story; but as no effort could have made these events sufficiently *piquante*, it is enlivened by some incidents that would have done admirably for Mrs. Radcliffe's novels. There is a pale persecuted nun who appears at intervals, and about whom the convent is kept in wonderment to know what she has done, or what has been done to her; at last she is reported dead, and the ceremonies of interment are gone through—but lo and behold! when the “nun” and her friend, making their escape with their future husbands, take refuge in a chapel, half a mile from the convent, a rumbling under ground is heard—a statue is pushed aside—a trap door is opened—and two brawny priests, one of them, of course, a Jesuit, are discovered dragging up the supposed dead nun, amidst awful threats of vengeance;—whether this wonderful story is one of the “various facts”* which came to the author's knowledge while on the continent, we cannot tell, but if so, we imagine she procured it through “one of her many means of obtaining information, which (as may be easily understood) she is not at liberty to particularize;”† and we give her credit for the “ingenious device,” by which, effectually baffling all enquiry from those who may feel themselves injured by her statements, she leaves for those who wish to be deceived “ample room and verge enough” for the unchecked exercise of their credulity. The same ingenuity is remarkable throughout this work; a parade is made in the preface of the author's desire to avoid exaggeration, and that “whenever she has brought forward any very strong doctrine of the Catholic Church she has been careful to give her authorities:” and accordingly we have one or two quotations from St. Anselm; a very wide reference, certainly, if intended to include the whole of his works, and needlessly vague, as we believe the quotations to be from a work condemned as spurious. Besides these, there are about half a dozen unquestionable quotations from the *Catéchisme Théologique, par le R. F. P. de la Compagne de Jesus*,—these are intended to give colour to a long string of pretty “strong doctrines,” which under their shelter are introduced without any authority of any kind, as for instance: “And it must ever be remembered that in the politics of the Church of Rome the end always sanctifies the means.”‡ “And all means are lawful which promote the honour and safety of our

* See prefacc.

† Ibid.

‡ P. 40.

holy Mother Church.”* It may be readily believed that we looked in vain for any reference here; yet if the author could not find what she doubtless looked for, a reference for them in the catechism of the Jesuits, did no doubt enter her mind that possibly these “strong doctrines” might not be held by the Church of Rome? Ah! but then what mattered it whether they were or not? if her readers believed that they were, her purpose was answered. Again, “Can there be holiness,” says a nun, “inherent in images made by man’s hand? For instance, did I not yesterday break by accident a *petit Jésus de cire*, smashing it all to pieces; was I then guilty of any horrid sacrilege?”† Is there any reference to the *Catechisme* for the doctrine which filled the nun’s head with such absurd ideas?—by no means. Instances of this kind of bad faith are more numerous than we can quote. When “the nun” says that “the elder *religieuses* had retired to their cells, no doubt in order to invoke those helpless idols, &c.,”‡ was not her conscience smitten by her own quotation from the Bishop of Montpellier’s Catechism? “We ought to pray to God only, as the source of all good and of all graces; and to Jesus Christ as our only mediator; we may pray to the Holy Virgin and the Saints as our intercessors near to Jesus Christ.”|| It is brought as a great charge against us—“That I have never seen a member of the Roman Catholic Church entirely at ease respecting his salvation; the very best of them hold the opinion that they *may* be lost in the eleventh hour;”§—this we admit; without going into the controversy, let it suffice that, with all deference to the superior holiness of our Protestant friends, we poor sinners are content to be no more secure than St. Paul was, when towards the close of his most glorious pilgrimage “he kept his body in subjection, lest while he preached to others he himself should become a castaway.” But if this doctrine be so heinous, why not leave it to excite the indignation it must merit, without adventitious aid, without the reinforcement of such a monstrous untruth as that which concludes the sentence:¶ “Nay, in the last moment of that hour, *through the neglect of some form.*” Where is the authority that bears out this “strong doctrine”? Did the authoress find it in that noble pattern of comprehensive Catholic charity, the ritual for the sick? but such trifles are beneath the attention of a sanctified Protestant. Where in the lives, the deaths, the writings of Catholics, does she find any confirmation for the following passages:—“In the same manner the poor penitent in the apostate Church, labours through each weary hour to augment his merits; feeling at the same time

* P. 125. † P. 93. ‡ P. 193. || P. 93. § P. 104. ¶ P. 104

how entirely these may be rendered null, even in the last hour of his life, by some failure in the required forms, and found not adequate in that hour of trial which follows death.”* And again, “You are not aware of the self-tortures inflicted and required by the Church—all, all of which are felt to be so inadequate for securing the end in view, that it often happens, that whilst the poor body sinks beneath the intolerable pressure of fasts and vigils, *the mind is not delivered from the horrors of despair.*”†

To what motive must we attribute the suppression, in another quotation, of just that part of a sentence which would have altered its whole character?—“I then believed that it was in the power of the priest, as holding the place of Jesus Christ, to absolve the penitent according to the Latin formula, ‘*Ego te absolvo a peccatis tuis.*’”‡ The real formula, as is well known to our Catholic readers, is “*Ego te absolvo in nomine Patris, et Filii, et Spiritus Sancti.*” and the authoress must have found it at full length in the “*Catéchisme*” to which she refers: why did she not quote it so? Because the truth would not have suited her purpose. But let her beware! out of evil comes not good; and such a system as this can never—could never, in any case—be suffered to do the work of the God that abhorreth a lie. It is a singular fact, and one which should, we think, alarm well-meaning Protestants, that no one ever yet began to attack the Catholic Church, however pure they might believe their motives, who was not drawn on to use the weapons of the Prince of Darkness, and to pervert the truth: let such as these observe themselves, when stating any Catholic doctrine or practice, in writing, or to an audience; *do they give it entire, as Catholics receive it? do they not seek to conceal something, to put forward something which may alter its whole character?* few, we believe, stop at such *half measures*: but we are speaking now to the conscientious, and we know that they cannot deny the charge; and, as in the presence of God, we ask these two plain questions:—“If their cause is the cause of truth, what need of management—why does not *truth* advance it?” “If the Catholic doctrines be adverse to those of Christianity, why can they not reveal them to a Christian people *as they are?*” It would be impossible: let them but introduce a single Catholic usage, form of words, or prayer, in their simple truth, and they instantly feel that, like a ray of light, it has made more manifest the surrounding darkness. The disputant is conscious that they are fragments from a different, a spiritualized system, and that no effort of his will prevail with the human heart, to admit that the serenely faithful

* P. 79.

† P. 53.

‡ P. 260.

and fervent spirit breathing through them can proceed from iniquity, or amalgamate with it: so, in the work before us, the system of a conventual life, which is, on the whole, correct, (the authoress boasts of having learned it from the superior of a convent), is so devout, so beautiful, that the bad characters introduced, the bad motives imputed, the wrangling, common-place controversy, and the ignoble remarks with which it is garbled, fail in overpowering its effect upon the mind: it resembles a strain of sweet and solemn music, appealing to be heard a moment amid a clash of vulgar and jarring noises. It is no argument to say, that the humility, order, self-denial, the recollection, and prayer and glowing charity, which are the essence of this life, and by which it becomes truly the portal of Heaven, may be wearisome to a weak and worldly-minded character like the "nun" we have before us: our answer is, that for such it was not intended; but if any one doubt that there are souls who find ineffable joy in thus embracing the cross of their Saviour, following his footsteps, and dwelling in close communion with him, let him look to the holy sisters who, even in this country—even here, where every prejudice and every constraint is against their doing so—yet seek the shelter of the convent walls, rejoice in its austerities, and die in its peace.

The next most impertinent little publication, is an account of the building of a Catholic chapel in a village blessed by a "Gospel ministry," and the effect it produces; how a few debauched and drunken people, scandals to their pious rector, are actually "bought by the Roman Catholics," and so persuaded to become converts; and how many hard-working and sober, or amiable and intelligent Catholics, astonished at the holiness of the characters around them, "have longed to know the secret spring from whence so much that is lovely took its rise." They have discovered the pure religion of the Bible, &c. &c.,* and, accordingly, have read, or are reading, their Bibles in secret. The main argument is carried on by a worthy gentleman (himself avowedly uninstructed) and his son-in-law, over "a nice poached egg and a rasher of bacon;" and such is the effect produced upon the mind of the poor man, that he turns his cat out of the room in a frenzy, comparing poor puss to the "Church of Rome, which put forth her velvet paws, and clawed hold of those who entered."† With these arguments we cannot think of encumbering our pages; they are too much like, in spirit and intention, to those we have already noticed, and less specious in the language. The great object of the work is to prove, that the erection of

* P. 197.

† P. 127.

Catholic chapels is not dangerous; that men “will not submit to be considered like dumb animals, who have no part or judgment in governing themselves;”* that although we may be “like birds bred up in a cage, not knowing the sweets of liberty, and content to remain in captivity,”† yet that free birds will not enter the cage; and so on: and the whole winds up with a commemoration of the Bible anniversary. To all this we make no objection; we may think our Protestants friends foolish to waste so much labour upon things which they consider of so little importance; but if their security tends to mitigate their ill-humour, it is all we can desire.

Let us now turn to the Catholic work whose style of language and controversy we have promised to set in opposition to our preceding specimens. *Geraldine* is a work peculiarly calculated for an inquirer after truth,—of that numerous class who, though not deeply read, possess the clear and cultivated intelligence which enables them to fix upon the leading points of the controversy, and to decide upon the kind of evidence which their own minds would require for coming to a decision upon them. Such a character is the heroine; a young lady of rank and fortune, who, in the long absence of her father (engaged in the present Peninsular war), is placed, as it were, under the guardianship of her numerous and highly respectable friends, whom, with great boldness and skill, the authoress has made the representatives of almost every phase of Protestantism. With excellent judgment, too, the story is opened when the terrors of the cholera, infecting the neighbouring town, are at their height; thus keeping alive the young lady’s attention to the importance of the subject, and at once introducing many of the points in dispute. *Geraldine* confesses that the fear of death has been aggravated to a painful degree by the distressing uncertainty of her mind upon religious subjects; and she pours forth the history of this vacillation and distress to her uncle and guest, the warden of ——— College, Oxford, a dignified representative of the present High Church Oxford party. He hears her with complacency, for her doubts have been originated in the dissensions of the Evangelicals. Her second uncle, Edmund Sinclair, the rector of the parish, belongs to the moderates of this party; her former governess had verged upon their more extreme opinions, had become estranged from her clergymen, and was finally separated from her pupil in consequence of a leaning to the notions of the Irvingites. This dissension between her two spiritual guides, is the first subject of dismay to *Geraldine*; but, before it occurs,

* P. 48.

† Ibid.

she has been introduced to all the “serious” society of Elverton: and here follows a light and good-humoured, but sufficiently poignant, account, of the disunion and dissensions of this society. If it is contended that there is a slight degree of caricature, in making *so many* of these dissensions to occur at once in the same small community, we may be half inclined to admit, that it would be an unusual piece of ill luck that so many points of difference should be started so simultaneously, and pursued so warmly. But the argument founded upon this want of unity in religious opinions, arising from absence of authority, would have been equally applicable, whether the differences were more or fewer; there is, therefore, no unfairness in the mistake, even if it be one: and if, for the sake of the story, the canvass has been a little overcrowded here, at any rate the truth of the design is unquestionable. The nature of the disputed points, the flippancy with which they are discussed, the interference of the women, and the gradual admixture of personal or party feelings, producing dissension, excitement gradually subsiding into indifference, until, at length, a Reformation Society is the signal for all differences to be forgotten, and all parties to unite against the Catholics;—who is there living in “religious society” who has not seen this?

The effect upon Geraldine’s mind is to give her a strong bias to Popery—but here the Warden interposes, and undertakes to prove to her, that the “English Catholic Church,” in other words the Church of England, is her safe resting-place, containing all the guidance and authority necessary to her perplexed mind, while casting off the pretensions and errors of the Church of Rome. This part of the dialogue is enlivened by the counter-reasonings of Geraldine’s intimate friend, a young Presbyterian lady, who attacks the pretensions of the Church of England with great spirit, while Geraldine is constantly endeavouring to carry out the principles her uncle lays down into their natural consequences—consequences which he as constantly disowns. The untenable position of the Church of England is thus made strikingly evident; Geraldine is recommended not to forsake her own Church till she has acted up to its precepts; and accordingly, with her prayer-book in her hand, she makes out a list of the fast days—and her failure in the attempt to procure the observance of the “hamper days,” as the butler denominates them, is extremely amusing. The Warden deserts her, he is afraid of being “accused of papistry;” Mrs. Sinclair writes her a letter, recommending her to “a fast of the spirit,” and “not to be entangled again with the yoke of bondage;” the servants rebel; and Geraldine is obliged to give up the fasting days.

To console herself, she plunges boldly into ecclesiastical history, that she may refresh her mind by studying, in the pure ages of the Church, the origin and prototype of the Church to which she has resolved to adhere ;—as might be supposed she is disappointed in her expectation, and, rendered distrustful by the failure, she resolves to put no faith in any one's assertions, but to seek the truth for herself.

The succeeding part of the first volume renders this admirable work a complete manual for converts under such circumstances. Geraldine pursues the truth from book to book, laying down such a course of study, as is neither open to the charge of one-sidedness, nor too laborious or learned for a mind of ordinary comprehensiveness and energy—yet following up so close a chain of argument, that the result approaches to demonstration ; the effects of this method of enquiry upon Geraldine's mind, as they gradually unfold themselves, are stated in long conversations with her mother's old friend—for the Warden, ere this, has left her—who also represents a particular class of opinions. Not greatly impressed with the importance of religious belief, but attached to the old Church by the associations of an antiquary and a man of taste, and averse by nature from prejudice and strife, Mr. Everard indulges in an Utopian scheme of such a comprehensive religious system, as the good of all parties could embrace by the aid of mutual concessions ; and to prepare Geraldine for this Utopia he gives her his best assistance in her progress to Catholicism.

Geraldine is now moved to a more active scene, being invited to spend the Christmas at the house of Lord and Lady Hungerford, easy and liberal people ; and the society she meets there is sketched in a tone of *piquante* liveliness, that relieves the gravity of the subject without ever bordering upon levity ; here she becomes acquainted with Lady Winefride, a Catholic lady ; and here also she is brought into collision with the high Calvinistic party,—the son of her host, who is attached to her, being of that persuasion. The announcement of a Reformation Society Meeting excites contending feelings in the little party.

“ Lady Winefride had arrived (at her own home) at the usual time for mass on the week days ; and at that very hour when the persecutions of ‘ her people ’ were being related at the priory, she was kneeling before the sanctuary at Burnleigh Chapel, favoured by a participation in the most blessed mystery of the altar ; and after such a communion with her God as a Catholic alone can know, the aged Christian was returning full of calm devotion to the priory, when in driving through the village of Sedgemoor, she saw, on a large placard, the same announcement which had occupied the thoughts of so many during that day. Lady Wine-

fride gave a mournful smile, as she traced the same watchwords which had ruined the fortunes, corrupted the integrity, or broken the hearts of those whose histories had been imprinted in her early memory. ‘Alarming increase of Popery’—‘Principles of the Glorious Reformation’—stood forth conspicuously in capitals, amid the smaller print, and furnished not only thoughts of the past, but meditation for the future, till she joined our heroine in the drawing-room of the priory.”—Vol. ii. p. 46.

This Reformation Society Geraldine is persuaded against her better judgment to attend, and then follows a highly satirical account of it. Yet we durst appeal to any of our Protestant readers whether the general character of such meetings has not been correctly caught, and fairly though forcibly rendered. We extract a few passages, to give an idea of the style rather than of the argument, which would only be weakened by extracts.

“After the treasurer had sat down, the secretary arose, to read the report of the labours of the society during the preceding year, in which their marches, and counter-marches, being productive of but two instances of seeming success, these anecdotes were thrown into a species of historical romance, for the excited and delighted ladies of Elverton. The horrors of popery, the cruel tyranny of the priests, the ignorant, deluded peasantry, formed subjects of eloquent declamation; but the actual facts were simply these: first, that a Catholic labourer, having quarrelled with his priest, had gone to America with his child, to read his Bible, and judge for himself of the true faith! (hear! hear!); second, that a Catholic priest himself had borrowed some controversial tracts from the Reformation Society, (hear! hear!) and had been heard to say, that he found much subject for thought in them. (Hear! hear! hear!)

“Geraldine found it impossible here to repress a smile, but the multitude around her saw no barrenness of material in the report; the fancy being warmed, and the ear pleased, by the accompanying phrases of—‘And though we cannot positively say, &c., yet we may confidently hope,’ &c. ‘The Lord’s arm is not shortened, that it cannot save.’ ‘We know in whom we trust.’ ‘We must not despise the day of small things,’ &c. In this way was filled a respectably sized manuscript, which at length was wound up by reading the first motion of the day:—‘That the report be printed,’ &c.; and the secretary, before retiring to his seat, now announced Viscount Hervey!”—Vol. ii. pp. 75-76.

“Here De Grey paused, and bowing to the chairman and to the meeting, retired from the front of the platform; and, whether it were from the novelty and excitement of hearing something on the opposite side of the question, or that the open countenance and manner of the young Catholic had softened their party prejudice, the applause at the conclusion of his address was given heartily and kindly, and many whispered encomiums followed, indicative of the discovery, that, although a papist, the young man had not turned out so great a fool as might have been expected. Room was politely made for him on the left hand of the chairman, and he had scarcely seated himself, when the lion of the day was perceived to mount

the steps of the platform, and amidst the perfect uproar of excitement and approval, the secretary, after several ineffectual efforts to be heard, at length raised his voice sufficiently to give forth, in resounding tones, the celebrated name of 'Mr. Shadowshake, that instant arrived from Ireland!' Fresh applause followed this announcement to the meeting of their favourite courier from the land of Hobgoblin, which applause was hushed into a perfect calm, as the reverend gentleman began to recount the terrific wonders and marvellous acts of popery in the sister isle; when after nearly an hour's address, during which he had seen, heard, conjectured, supposed, believed, and taken for granted, more Satanic exploits than any one who had not followed Mephistophiles over the Brocken, Mr. Shadowshake clasped his hands, and exclaimed,—'Indeed! indeed! my heart weeps tears of blood for Ireland. My unhappy country has become a den of wild beasts;—yes, the Romish priests are wild beasts, they are hyenas!!' With this the reverend Reformer sank back exhausted, his face covered with the sympathetic dew of fear—and heat; and a glass of water was handed to him, as he reposed at the back of the platform. The noble chairman now put to the 'Ayes' and 'Noes' of the assembly, whether, before breaking up the meeting, with the concluding prayer and psalm, an Irish gentleman, who had come over from Ireland in the same packet with Mr. Shadowshake, should be permitted to address the meeting on the subject of Ireland's religion, and Ireland's distress, for the space of half an hour? The 'Ayes' carried it, and one of the most sunny countenances that Erin could produce, presented itself at the railing of the platform, and in a strong Irish accent, Mr. O'Neil thus began:—'I am indebted to the courage of the noble lord and his friends on the platform, for the liberty allowed me of advancing to this barrier, from which, having in honour bound myself not to leap down among you, I may venture to acknowledge, even to the timid sex here present, that I am a—wild beast! in fact, a hyena (loud laughter)—to the excited imagination, at least, of my honest countryman who has just preceded me. Yes! my English fellow Christians,' continued he, in a changed and deeply impressive tone, 'I am an Irish Catholic priest! one of that race, whose cruelty, rapacity, and usurped power, have been the theme held up this day for your execration. And now, what can I reply? Why this—that we Irish Catholic priests have learned your notions of us, and, as the servants of Him, who, when He was reviled, reviled not again, have also learned forbearance and compassion for the calumnies you utter. Scarcely a speech has been uttered this day, but it has been said of Ireland, that 'darkness covered the land, and gross darkness the people;' and I admit that, during many years, the dearth of learning was most lamentable. (Hear.) Ah, my friends, you are pleased with this concession on my part! wait a little, however, for I shall expect the same candour from you! Our enquiry is, whether this ignorance was owing to the priesthood. From the year 1695, to the year 1782, an act of your parliament was in force, in Ireland, by which the Catholic priest and the Catholic schoolmaster were transported, if the one were

discovered instructing the people in the mysteries of religion, or the other teaching the children the simple elements of education. (Hear! hear!) This act extended to Catholic printers and booksellers, and by no means remained a dead letter, as four hundred and twenty-four priests were shipped off, and large rewards offered to any one who should find the unlawful practice of education going forward. My dear old father is still alive, he is fast approaching his ninety-ninth year, and to this day he boasts of having got his learning as he got his whiskey—both illegally. (a laugh.) Yes! in bogs, under hedges, and in deep vallies, the priest and schoolmaster carried on their illicit process of education, while some of the boys stood on the neighbouring hill to give the alarm, if the *Discoverers*, as they were called, should appear in view, to catch, and send the Catholic tutors abroad. (Hear! hear!) Now, my friends, take this fact. It is not yet fifty years since these Protestant laws were repealed, so that every Irish Catholic beyond the age of fifty, who can read or write, read and writes illegally. He got his learning in violation of the laws at home, or he smuggled it from the continent. And now what think you? Why, a truce to pleasantry, when those men, who regret that these cruel, tyrannical laws were ever repealed, are the persons to come forward, and taunt us with our ignorance. (Hear! hear!) Yes! they, and such as they, have walled up, and would again wall up, the fountain of knowledge, and then reproach us with not having drunk deep of it! They seal up the volume of science, and if we stretch forth a hand to open it, they strike, and while striking, wantonly reproach us for being ignorant of its contents.'"—Vol. ii. pp. 98-101, 103, 104.

It may readily be supposed that on Geraldine's return to her friends, their anxiety respecting her draws to a crisis, and the feelings of a convert are sketched with as much truth as delicacy

"It was on the opposite side of the water that Geraldine and Major Tankerville had parted, and after sometime watching the evolutions of the skaiters, her attention was drawn to the position in which she stood with respect to the rest of the party; a relative position, which was in perfect keeping with her approaching declaration of the faith she inwardly cherished. Between herself, and her still kind, though anxious, friends, lay deep waters, only to be passed by means of a brittle surface, which seemed to her no inapt representation of the forbearance and charity of the controversial world towards a convert to the ancient Church. She now looked earnestly at the group, from which she had thus accidentally been separated, and her heart sank, as she rapidly threw a prospective glance on her intercourse, as a convert to Catholicity, with these her protesting friends."—Vol. ii. pp. 137, 138.

Her description of the arguments of Major Tankerville is one to which we must not expect our Protestant readers to agree, but how many Catholics will at once recognize the description.

"‘I have heard,’ continued Geraldine, ‘of some orators in Parliament, who can make a grand opening speech, but who can never reply. This is the case with Major Tankerville. He cannot reply, and therefore he

cannot converse. He starts well enough, and you are forced to listen with respect, because he repeats so much of the sacred Word of God : but when, in your turn, you object that such and such texts cannot be applied where he would apply them, because of such and such reasons, he cannot combat those reasons. I often wondered, during our walk, that he could not bring forward something in answer to my objections. I almost longed to help him. His only resource was to repeat these same misapplied texts in a louder tone, which, as I told him, left the point in debate exactly where it was before.'"—Vol. ii. p. 139.

Then follows a spirited statement of an argument, which, were Protestants consistent, must long ago have obtained for us not only toleration but sincere approval.

“ ‘ In reply to his assertion, that the Bible was to be our sole guide, for that the spirit accompanied the sincere reader, I told him that my private study of the Bible had determined me to be a Catholic ! He spoke against human authority, and I agreed with him, and objected to any one’s presuming to interfere between God and my soul, and inquired, how it was that he could venture to speak to me, when I had a Bible ? In fact, I claimed every privilege, equally with himself, of choosing or rejecting exactly what appeared to my own judgment wise and good. I said that, if I found more wisdom in the early councils than in the modern religious societies, I had every right to my preference ; that, if the Fathers of the early Church were but men, what then were their successors ? What were the Fathers of the English Church, and those of the Kirk of Scotland—the framers of the Thirty-nine Articles, or of the Assembly’s Catechism ? Major Tankerville did not attempt to defend these authorities : he considered them to be only ‘ partially enlightened ;’—therefore I proceeded to his own particular set of highly illuminated Christians—the chairman and committees of the Bible Society, Tract Society, Reformation Society, &c., and inquired upon what grounds I was to yield my private judgment to them ? Were they more than uninspired men ? Most assuredly and avowedly not. Then, why were these men to interpret, and dictate, and dogmatize to *me*, a Bible reader, when they own, nay, even boast, that the Holy Ghost has *not* overruled their decisions ? ”

We will be tempted by only one more quotation from the controversy ; but one more we will give, both as a specimen of style, a sort of summary of argument, and because that passage which refers to the proper use of the imagination, is an excellent answer to an old subject of attack upon us.

“ ‘ But I foresee that, when once in the Roman Catholic Church, and by degrees accustomed to, and satiated by, all the wonders and mysteries of that mighty pile of accumulated belief, you will then sigh after more than even that abundant storehouse can bestow !’

“ ‘ You are right, Katherine ! I shall still, I trust, sigh after that full, perfect, all-satisfying Church, to be found only in heaven. Yet, in that militant part of the Universal Church, of which I am in heart a mem-

ber, struggling and imperfect though it be, I enter the bright vista leading to the eternal portals, I mount the first step of the Patriarch's ladder. That perfect communion between the glorified and militant Church throws a halo round the latter, full of inspiration. It beckons onward !'

" ' Almost all the party here, Geraldine, are persuaded that you are led into the Romish Church entirely by your imagination.'

" ' Let one of them conquer me in stiff and sober argument, before they repeat this absurd charge,' cried Geraldine; ' or let them, in penance for it, wade through all the tomes I have done, making notes, comparing one author with another, and searching for truth, with infinitely more trouble and labour, than if I had merely jumped after it to the bottom of a well.'

" ' Again a metaphor,' said Katherine, smiling.

" ' Well, then,' continued Geraldine, ' do you not see, Kate, that if I possess this imagination, this love of excitement, this perception of the vast, the beautiful, the harmonious, no other religion than the Roman Catholic can possibly satisfy me. In fact, my friends here are so far right, that my imagination, together with every power of my mind, and every faculty of my soul, leads me there. But these friends, and almost every one in this cold, calculating age, speak of imagination as though it were a crime, never reflecting that, if God be not the author of evil, He cannot bestow evil gifts upon His children. It is man who perverts and misuses every heavenly gift; and how? By expending it upon the things of earth. But am I doing this? It is in vain for my friends to indulge the hope, that this, to them, alarming faculty of mine can be crushed and annihilated. I can no more still the aspirations of the imagination, than I can those of the mind and soul, of which I deem it the offspring. Possessing, then, a gift which cannot be destroyed, and which, if not used, will be abused—how is it to be employed?'

" ' Certainly, in the service of God,' replied Katherine; ' but even then not with extravagance; for St. Paul says, ' Let your moderation be known unto all men.'

" ' Or,' rejoined Geraldine, ' as the Catholic version has it, ' Let your modesty be known unto all men,' which version I prefer. But do not expect me any longer to argue by opposition of texts on any subject. Three hundred years have proved its inefficacy in settling disputes amongst Protestants, and I consider it as a desecration of the sacred word of God. The sense of the Bible is gathered from the grand whole, not from detached parts; and the entire weight of Scripture goes to prove that we are to offer up our whole being to our God.'

" ' I know, and trust I observe, that truth,' replied Katherine; ' but remember, that God, who gave you an exalted imagination, gave you also judgment and common sense, of which fully as strict an account will be demanded, as of the other more brilliant quality.'

" ' Granted! my dear friend; and this is the account I can give of my judgment and common sense, which two qualities are exclusively canonized and worshipped in this our nineteenth century. When I began to reflect that my title of ' Protestant' was a negative one, and referred to something positive and precursive, I immediately made my-

self acquainted with that against which I had been all my life protesting : now, that shewed some judgment ! And when, on the investigation of this original Church, finding nothing to protest against, I protested no longer—surely this was common sense in its most palpable form !

“ Katherine smiled, and sighed. ‘ Then I may tell Lord Hervey that you have irrevocably made up your mind ?’

“ ‘ You may,’ replied Geraldine ; but the animation of her countenance passed away as she said this, and she also sighed.”

Geraldine now returns home, a professing, though not a received Catholic ; and in the remainder of the work, the various difficulties and trials of a convert are admirably sketched or hinted at.

Although the book does not for a moment verge upon a love story, yet both Sir Eustace de Grey and Lord Herbert are represented as attached to her (the latter she has refused) ; and her situation with respect to them is thus hinted at :—

“ To brave the world in the cause of truth ; to join the band of hitherto aspersed Christian worshippers ; to sacrifice riches, and popularity, and even the softer feelings of the heart, to the voice of conscience, all this was to bear adversity in the way that exactly suited her lofty nature : but to become a Catholic when all the neighbourhood were persuaded that she did so for the sake of Sir Eustace de Grey ; to refuse Lord Hervey, when rumour gave forth that the difficulties had not been on her side, but on his ; to pursue the course which would appear to justify all these assertions,—this was to bear adversity in the way that was the most galling to a proud and sensitive woman, and Geraldine recoiled from her appointed task.”

She, however, continues firm ; hears, while her heart is wrung with anguish, the reproach “ that it had become part of her new creed not to feel ;” and makes the dreaded communication to her father.—How it is received by him we shall not state : for, the conclusion having the unusual merit of taking the reader by surprise, we should be sorry to diminish its effect, sincerely believing that no one, of any persuasion, will read this work without amusement as well as instruction.

Father Rowland is a little story, originally American, but enlarged and corrected by a Catholic priest. We need not say that it contains most valuable information. The arguments are stated with great precision and clearness ; but we regret that a little more attention has not been given to the narrative part of the work, which is not always in the best taste. There is another Catholic publication, entitled, *The Converts, a Tale of the Nineteenth Century*, to which we must apply the same remark. We regret to notice it disadvantageously ; for it is written by a convert, and with all the warmth of sincerity and fervour :

but the incidents are so improbable, and so little judgment is shewn in many parts of the story, that we cannot expect it to do good, whatever we may hope from some future and more matured production of the authoress's pen.

The Prize Book is on the same plan as *Alton Park*, but much inferior to it, and adapted for a lower class of readers.

Our limits remind us to conclude our enumeration. We must, however, mention *Mrs. Herbert; or, the Villagers*, and *Alton Park*, although they do not come strictly within the scope of our article; but we are anxious to express our approbation of works which have long formed most valuable additions to the libraries of the youthful members of our Church, and in which many more advanced in years might find information. In both these books controversy is seldom, and only incidentally introduced; their chief end being to convey instruction upon the doctrines and practices of the Church, and upon portions of Holy Writ: and this they have done with great clearness and fidelity, and in a pleasing manner. If we have any fault to find, it is that in both works there is too close an adherence to the mere matter of fact (if we may term it so) of religion. A little less fear of Protestant misrepresentation; a somewhat bolder trust in children's perception of the beautiful, in the scope of their imaginations, and their delight in contemplating what is elevated, symbolic, or mysterious, would have given them a deeper interest in the minds of those for whom they were intended. Such as they are, however, we should gladly welcome more such publications: many beautiful Protestant stories our children are debarred from, on account of their tendency, and we have few to supply their place; yet we have abundance of materials for them in the lives of the saints, authentic miracles of a later date, in many beautiful legends preserved by the pious; or, for more domestic stories, in the family history of the Catholic gentry, and in the annals of our poor, are many subjects which would require little extraneous embellishment, and through which might be infused, into the minds of our children, the full spirit and beauty of Catholicity. Fiction is too strong a weapon to be left to our opponents; we must enlist it on our side; and if we use it with judgment and uprightness, we shall find it of incalculable advantage in attracting the minds and hearts of the young to the cause of our holy religion.

MISCELLANEOUS INTELLIGENCE.

ROME.—At the meeting of the Archeological Academy on the 17th May, the Secretary, Visconti, read an account of an interesting and important discovery made in a vineyard situated without the gate of Sta. Maria Maggiore, near the church of SS. Peter and Marcellinus and the tomb of St. Helen. The proprietor was led from some remains of antiquity, found on the property, to examine an old neglected building, in the floor of which he discovered an entrance to a subterranean gallery, which had been filled with soil falling through apertures made in the ceiling for the admission of air. He caused the passage to be cleared, at a considerable expense, and was amply rewarded by the discovery of a mosaic pavement seventy-two palms in length and five in breadth. He immediately caused the excavation to be examined by the learned Secretary, who, from the close resemblance of the tombs to those in the catacombs, and principally from the emblems of the cross in the pavement, at once pronounced it to be a branch of the ancient cemetery known by the name of St. Tiburtius, SS. Peter and Marcellinus, and *inter duas lauros*. The gallery is of the same vaulted form as the other catacombs, but is higher and more spacious; along the sides and in the transverse galleries which cross the main branch, are tombs about seven feet in length and two in height, hollowed in the wall, or in the form of altars with arches over them. The mosaic pavement is of the most elegant and varied design, and, besides the figure of a dove bearing an olive branch, ornaments, emblematic of the cross, are repeated in different forms. We are inclined to believe from an inspection of it, that the pavement was executed about the time of Constantine, and that a passage will shortly be discovered, connecting it with the well known cemetery mentioned above. It has been visited by his Holiness and the chief nobility, as well as by several of the first antiquarians of the holy city.

During the ravages of the cholera last year, his Holiness made a solemn promise on behalf of his diocese to dedicate to the Blessed Virgin a pledge of gratitude for the cessation of that dreadful scourge. The feast of the Assumption was fixed upon for the performance of this vow. At an early hour, his Holiness celebrated mass in the basilica of Santa Maria Maggiore, and gave the holy communion to a large concourse of the faithful. He afterwards heard another mass; and after taking a slight refreshment in the adjoining apartments, returned to the church, which had been gorgeously decorated for the occasion. The most ancient picture of the Holy Mother and her Divine Son, ascribed by popular tradition to St. Luke, which was carried in procession last year to obtain the powerful protection of the Mother of God, had been placed on an elevated platform behind the high altar. Seats were placed in front for the Cardinals, and on each side, galleries were raised for the Queen Dowager of Sardinia and other royal personages, and the diplomatic body. Lines of soldiers, along the nave and in different parts of the church, added to the splendour of the scene. His Holiness recited the prescribed prayers, and blessed the offerings, which consisted of two

golden crowns of the richest execution and the most elegant design, weighing thirty ounces, and decorated with the valuable jewels lately presented to the Pope by the Queen and other illustrious individuals. He then mounted the steps of the platform, followed by two Cardinals and other attendants, and placed the crowns on the heads of our blessed Saviour and his Virgin Mother. No sooner were they seen glittering on high than a murmur of joy, like the noise of sea-waves subsiding, was uttered by the whole assembly, and hushed in a moment. High Mass was celebrated by Cardinal Patrizi, and after the last gospel, the Pope gave his solemn benediction, from the gallery over the entrance of the church, to the immense multitude. In the afternoon, the picture was replaced in the chapel of the Borghese family. The city was illuminated at night as well as on the preceding evening. The expenses of the decoration of the church, and of the two crowns, were wholly defrayed from the Pope's privy purse.

On the feast of St. Ignatius, the city of Rome presented to the Society of Jesus, six magnificent candlesticks of gilt metal, for the altar of the Saint, as a public testimonial and monument of gratitude, for the generous and disinterested conduct of its members in devoting themselves, day and night, during the late awful visitation, to the spiritual and corporal necessities of the faithful, in the hospitals and in every part of the city.

The Sanitary Commission has presented an elegant chalice to the church of the *Ben-fratelli*, or brothers of Mercy, instituted by St. John of God, with an inscription commemorative of their zealous care of the sick on the same occasion.

On Sunday, June 29, the Rev. Dr. Hynes was consecrated Bishop of Leros *in partibus*, by the Right Rev. Dr. O'Finan, Bishop of Killala, in the church of St. Vincent of Paul. His lordship has been appointed Vicar Apostolic in the Ionian Islands.

We have great pleasure in recording the gracious manner in which his Holiness was pleased to receive a copy of the engraving by Luston of Mr. Linton's painting of the *Darkness over Jerusalem during the Crucifixion*, presented by the latter gentleman. His Holiness has expressed in the strongest terms his admiration of the work, and has forwarded a case of medals to Mr. Linton, through Cardinal Lambruschini, the Secretary of State. To the high commendations bestowed on this work in England, we may add that of a missionary, lately returned from the Holy Land, in praise of the design, and its close resemblance to the locality,—an encomium which is greatly enhanced by the circumstance that the clever artist has never visited Jerusalem.

We lately mentioned a subscription set on foot in France to present to the Archbishop of Cologne a picture by M. Hauser. The young artist lately sent to his Holiness a sketch of the painting through the Brazilian minister, M. Moutinho Lima. His Holiness has requested the Secretary of State to express to M. Hauser the gratitude with which he receives the gift, as a mark of which, he has presented him with the medal struck on occasion of the opening of the Gregorian Museum.

Father G ramb, whom we mentioned in a former number, (Vol. II.

p. 597) has been appointed Abbot and Procurator-General of the Trappists by his Holiness. This is the first instance of a religious not in holy orders being raised to the rank of Abbot. He has received the tonsure from Cardinal Lambruschini. An account of his recent journey to Rome is expected shortly to appear.

A secret Consistory was held on the 13th of September, in which the Pope raised Monsig. Fieschi, his Maggiordomo, and Monsig. Sterckx, Archbishop of Mechlin, to the dignity of Cardinals. We have already described the ceremonies used on such occasions, and take this opportunity of presenting our readers with the allocution addressed to the Sacred College, which is a specimen of the form usually adopted in promoting Cardinals :—" Venerable Brethren, whilst in the bestowal of honours, our choice is naturally directed to those whose virtue as well as zeal towards the Holy See have been conspicuously attested, it is incumbent on us to have a special regard to such as have rendered peculiar services to our person. Of this number, we are bound to consider our beloved Adrian Fieschi, Prefect of our Papal Household. Noble by birth, and gifted with eminent qualities of mind, after having been first admitted into the congregation styled *di buon Governo*, he discharged the duties of the vicarious Legation of Bologna, and in succession, the Delegations of Spoleto, Perugia, Macerata, and Camerino, and has since been sedulously employed in the posts of Master of Audiences and Prefect of the Household. Besides the uniform exactness with which he has fulfilled the numerous and weighty obligations of his office, no one can be ignorant of the zeal he has manifested on various occasions for our safety and security. Wherefore, in the Secret Consistory held on the twenty-third of June, in the year 1834, we created him Cardinal, reserving for a time the announcement of his creation; now, however, we consider it unnecessary to withhold any longer the communication of our sentiments respecting him from you, Venerable Brethren, and we therefore declare him Cardinal of the Holy Roman Church.

" We have moreover judged it fitting to create two other Cardinals, of whom, one we declare; the other we reserve *in petto*.* The claim of the former to be raised to your exalted order has been sufficiently proved by the signal services which he has rendered to the Catholic religion in Belgium. We have, indeed, ever been persuaded and convinced of that nation's zeal and sincerity in the cause of religion, so much, as long since to have contemplated with satisfaction the services which it was calculated to render to the interests of the Catholic Church, and the salvation of souls. With this, our expectation and your wishes, Venerable Brethren, events have, through the mercy of God, and to our heartfelt delight in common with yours, most happily corresponded. For it is well known that in Belgium the seminaries and establishments of every kind, which are committed to the care of ecclesiastical superiors for the purpose of training up youth of either sex, however poor, in learning and piety, are in the most flourishing condition. The Catholic Univer-

* This is the usual expression when the Pope defers the announcement of a Cardinal's creation to a more fitting opportunity.

sity of Louvain, some years since re-established at a vast expense, is highly to be commended for the excellence of the method and character of the instruction it delivers; while not merely the clergy, but the whole body of the faithful are distinguished by their exemplary attachment and submission to this chair of St. Peter; in fine, to express in a word that which is the abundant and unfailing source of all these blessings, the provinces of Belgium are not in the smallest degree restrained from freely communicating with the Holy See, the centre of Catholic unity, in all spiritual and ecclesiastical affairs. These blessings, a source to us of infinite joy, are to be ascribed to the entire order of our Venerable Brethren, the bishops of that kingdom, whose assiduous vigilance and singular zeal in cultivating the vineyard of our Lord, we take occasion deservedly to extol: and more than all, this praise is due to our Venerable Brother, Engelbert Sterckx, Archbishop of Mechlin, a man eminently conspicuous for purity of morals, learning, piety, prudence, and mildness of disposition,—qualities which have recommended and endeared him not merely to the prelates, clergy, and people, but also to his Majesty the King of Belgium. Wherefore, having long had it in contemplation to give to the entire Belgian nation a mark of our paternal affection, it hath appeared to us, that none could prove more acceptable to the nation itself, or more suitable to our intentions, than the adoption of our venerable brother, Engelbert, Archbishop of Mechlin, into your Sacred College.

“Another Cardinal of the Holy Roman Church, as we have already mentioned, we intend to create, but reserve the declaration of his name to a more fitting opportunity.

“*Quid vobis videtur?*

“By the authority of Almighty God, by that of the holy Apostles Peter, and Paul, and our own, We declare ADRIAN FIESCHI, Cardinal Deacon of the Holy Roman Church.

“We moreover create Engelbert Sterckx, Cardinal Priest of the Holy Roman Church, with the usual and necessary dispensations, derogations and exceptions.

“We also create another Cardinal to be hereafter announced at our will and pleasure.

“In the name of the Father ✠, and of the Son ✠, and of the Holy ✠ Ghost. Amen.”

On the occasion of investing these Cardinals with the insignia of their new dignity, his Holiness delivered another allocution, in which he expresses his satisfaction at the request of the King of the French, for the appointment of a bishop for Algiers, and praises the piety and ability of the elect. In the second part, he describes in strong and affecting terms the conduct of Monsig. Martin Dunin, Archbishop of Posen and Gnesen, in the matter of mixed marriages, his seizure by the officers of the King of Prussia, and, in conclusion, feelingly protests against the King's conduct, applauds the zeal and intrepidity of the prelate, and expresses his confidence that the rest of the clergy will display equal resolution; and earnestly implores Almighty God to put a speedy end to the troubles of his church.

In consequence of the elevation of Cardinal Fieschi, Monsignor

Massimo has been appointed Maggiordomo of his Holiness; he is succeeded as Maestro di Camera by Monsignor Pallavicini, late delegate at Perugia.

An extraordinary fact has recently come to light which forms the prevailing topic of conversation at Rome. The family of Doria Pamfili is patron of the College of St. Agnes, founded by Innocent X. This college possessed a valuable collection of documents of the reign of Clement VIII and his successors, preserved in the archives. A few weeks since, a portion of the correspondence of Clement VIII with his Nuncios in Spain, was discovered in a grocer's shop. On inquiry, it was found that he had purchased a large quantity of similar papers from a servant in the college, and the sacristan of the church attached to it; and, upon farther examination, it was found that twenty-eight closets had been plundered of their contents. By order of Cardinal Lambruschini, Professor Sarti, of the University, accompanied by a body of police, searched the shops of the city, and succeeded in recovering the contents of seven of the closets. Amongst the documents still missing, are the original acts of the canonization of St. Aloysius.

M. Lacordaire has obtained from the Holy See the restoration of the Order of St. Dominic in France, and is now in that country collecting candidates for admission into it. The Convent of St. Sabina on Mount Aventine has been placed at their disposal. They will spend a year's novitiate in Rome, and then return to France.

On Sunday, July 19, the body of St. Bonosa, virgin and martyr in the third century, was solemnly translated from the Church of St. Apollinaris, to the Church dedicated to the Saint, which had been for some years closed on account of its dilapidated condition. The body of the Saint was carried in a richly decorated shrine; and the procession was attended by several cardinals and prelates, as well as by the students of the Roman Seminary and different confraternities. Tapestries were displayed from the windows along the whole line of the procession; and an immense concourse of the faithful flocked to witness the spectacle.

FRANCE.—The Minister of Public Instruction has presented a report to the King, of which we give the substance, on the state of education in that country in 1837.

Of 35,280 communes or unions of communes, 29,613 are provided with schools; being an increase of 3,771 over the number in 1834, and 8,563 over that in 1829.

The number of pupils of both sexes admitted into the primary and other schools directed by masters was as follows:—

1829	.	.	.	939,340
1832	.	.	.	1,200,715
1834	.	.	.	1,634,828
1837	.	.	.	1,949,830

making an increase of 295,002 over 1834, and 980,490, or nearly a million, over 1829.

The schools directed by mistresses, reckon no more than 707,511 out of 1,110,147 who receive primary instruction.

26,370 schools belonging to communes are exclusively for Catholics;

563 for Protestants, 28 for Jews, and 2,352 for all persuasions indiscriminately.

In 1834, 10,315 schools belonged to the communes, and 1,909 were in course of purchase or erection ;—total 12,255.

In 1837, 14,139 were possessed by them, 2,643 were in course of purchase or erection: making an increase of 4,557 over 1834.

The *Journal de l'Instruction Publique* mentions, that the Faculty of Theology at Rouen will shortly be re-established, and gives the most satisfactory accounts of the progress of that of Lyons.

The Brothers of Christian Doctrine possess in France 267 establishments, containing 119,908 scholars; 9 in the Papal States; 8 in Piedmont; 14 in Savoy; 11 in Belgium; 3 in the Isle of Bourbon, and 1 in Canada.

In December 1837, a commission was organised, under the title of *Comité Historique des Arts et Monumens*, to investigate the state of the cathedrals and other public monuments of art in France, to distribute the sums voted by the Chambers for their repair, and to publish plans and descriptions of the principal cathedrals. They have been especially instructed to watch over the repairs made throughout the kingdom, with a view of causing them to be conducted in conformity with the style of the rest of the edifice and the best models, and of thus preventing the ill-judged and barbarous additions which have destroyed the beauty of the finest buildings both in England and in France. The description of the *Palais de Justice*, and the *Sainte Chapelle* in Paris, is to be immediately published under the care of the Count de Montalembert, whose taste and ability cannot be too highly appreciated. Baron Taylor, by whose exertions the large addition of Spanish paintings has lately been made to the rich collections possessed by the public galleries of Paris, has been appointed a member, and has expressed his earnest desire to obtain the abrogation of the law forbidding interments in the churches, on the ground that their unwholesomeness is at best very problematical, while the churches would be enriched, in course of time, by the splendid monuments erected to the deceased. A list is to be presented in a few days of the persons in England and other countries worthy of being appointed corresponding members. The course of Lectures delivered by M. Lacordaire at Metz, which had occupied several months, closed in the end of May. They had been attended from the beginning with the most unwearying assiduity, by an immense concourse of people, especially of young men, many of them belonging to the army; and the most salutary fruits have resulted from the zeal of the preacher, the labours of the resident clergy, and the piety of the people.

BAVARIA.—The cathedral of Ratisbon, one of the finest specimens of German architecture, has been restored by the king's order, in a style which perfectly harmonises with the rest of the building; and has been farther enriched by a mausoleum erected by his majesty to Monsignor Sailer, and another erected by the faithful to Monsignor Wittman, both bishops of that city. The amount of pious donations in the diocese of Ratisbon, in the year 1837, reaches 54,623 florins. For the repairs of the ancient monastery of Our Lady at Chiemsée, the king has allowed

from his privy purse, 36,000 florins. He has ordered the restoration of the Benedictine convent at Scheyern, at an expense of 53,000 florins, and has transferred the revenues of several forests to the monks. The central house of the Sisters of Charity at Munich, is rapidly extending its branch-convents. It contains forty-six members; Landshut seven; Ratisbon five; Neumarckt two, and Aschaffembourg four: there are fifty candidates for admission, seven of whom are Tyrolese, and are to return to Inspruck, where an hospital is to be placed under their care.

The German journals announce the lamented death, on the 12th of April, of Dr. John Adam Möhler, Chevalier of the order of St. Michael, and Dean of the Chapter of Wurtzburg. A disease of the lungs, aggravated by fever, carried him to the grave at the age of forty-two years. Möhler was called from Tübingen to the University of Munich, where he soon won, by his affability and amiable character, the affection and respect of all who knew him. The students in particular testified the highest respect for him, and whatever difference of opinion might prevail as to his views, all concurred in regarding him as the ornament of the University. Unhappily, his health was undermined before he went thither, and more than once his lectures were interrupted by sickness. The hope that a milder climate might benefit his health, and prolong a life so dear to religion and to learning, induced the King of Bavaria to appoint him to the Deanery of Wurtzburg. At first his malady seemed to abate, until a fever seized him, to which his exhausted frame speedily fell a victim. His loss has left a void that all Europe as well as Germany will feel; for his writings, especially the treatise on the *Unity of the Church*, the *Life of St. Athanasius*, and the *Symbolik*, together with a series of admirable articles published in the *Theological Journal* of Tübingen, have raised Möhler to a lasting pre-eminence amongst modern Catholic divines. The last-named work may be considered a continuation and appendix to Bossuet's celebrated *Variations*, as it forms a compendium of the Confessions of Faith published by the Reformed Churches, contrasted on the leading subjects of controversy with the pure unvarying faith of the Catholic Church, displayed in the decrees of the Council of Trent, and other acknowledged sources. It was most favourably received; four editions in the course of two years, translations into Latin, and lately into French, its adoption as the school-book in Giessen and other Universities, prove the high estimation in which it is held. "There are three works," said the King of Prussia, "which I would pay generously to have refuted; the first of them is Möhler's *Symbolik*." Adversaries have not been wanting in the contest against this triumphant enemy of Protestantism. Bauer, in his *Reply to the work of Mons. Möhler against the Protestant Belief and Church*, Pflanz, Marheineke, Sartorius, and Tafel, and the Protestant University of Tübingen, have endeavoured to refute; the *Symbolik*, while it has been defended by Gunter, Studenmayer, Kuhn, and other Catholic divines. The subject of the work on the *Unity of the Church*, may be explained in a few words: truth and love are the foundations of the Christian society. In the first part of the work, the author shows the triumph of doctrinal truth over heresies in all ages; the second part displays love, the daughter of truth

uniting all the members of the Church in one body, excluding from its bosom schism and dissension. The persecutions raised against him on account of the former work, induced him to seek an asylum at Munich; and his physicians have declared, since his death, that that deplorable event was hastened by the religious troubles in Prussia. Möhler may, therefore, be considered a martyr to that truth, in defence of which the whole of his useful life was spent.

We are much gratified to learn, that the able and highly gifted Professors Schilling and Schubert, have been lately converted to the Catholic religion. Three other men, well known in the literary world, are engaged in conferences with Görres, on the Catholic faith, which they are disposed to embrace. A letter dated from Francfort, May 20, announces that on the 15th of that month, Dr. J. Schuster, a Jew, distinguished for his literary acquirements, editor of the *Gazette of Conversations*, which appears with the *Frankfort Journal*, (*The Post*,) had received baptism, and had embraced the ancient faith. The conversion of one placed in such an independent position, and in a town so completely Protestant, has been ascribed to the sermons of the celebrated Dr. Hörter, which he frequently attended.

NAPLES.—The queen has collected fifty female children, whose parents were carried off by the cholera, in the convent of the Heart of Jesus, where they will be brought up under her auspices, and at her expense.

PRUSSIA.—The Bishop of Ermeland, with the bishops of Munster and Paderborn, have notified to the government their adhesion to the bull of Pius VIII on mixed marriages, and, consequently, their opposition to the practice sought to be introduced into that kingdom; which they declare to be contrary to the canons and discipline of the Catholic Church. The Bishop of Munster is suffragan and brother of the Archbishop of Cologne. Of the four bishoprics in the Rhenish provinces of Prussia, three have declared their intention of acting conformably to the Bull; the fourth (Treves) is vacant. The clergy belonging to the deanery of Inowracław, in the diocese of Posen, have addressed a letter to the president of the province, protesting that they cannot follow the rules laid down by the government on the subject of mixed marriages, without betraying the cause which they have sworn to maintain.

AUSTRIA.—The *Lemberg Gazette* (Gallicia) gives the following consoling intelligence:—"The people of this city have been agreeably surprised with the tidings of the donation made by Count Stanislas Habdank Skarbeck, of all his property, for the establishment of an asylum for the poor and for orphans, the want of which has been much felt in the capital of this large province. It is his intention to erect houses capable of containing 400 poor and 600 orphans: the latter will be educated, and apprenticed to different trades. He has given up for this work and its support, his entire property, described in an authentic legal instrument; in which are mentioned, three towns, thirty villages, the theatre of Lemberg, with all the adjoining buildings, and all the property he may acquire during his lifetime; and expressing his intention to bequeath all his property, without exception, to the new establishment.

HUNGARY.—The *Presburg Gazette* announces the death of Monsi .

Joseph de Vurum, Bishop of Nitria in Hungary. By his will he has added to the numberless patriotic actions performed in his lifetime. With the exception of a few legacies to individuals, he has devoted his whole fortune to provide shelter for poor clergymen and schoolmasters: he has left the princely donation of 100,000 florins to an orphan asylum, in which children are instructed in the different trades, and for the foundation of which he had already given 40,000 florins; funds are also provided in the convent of Ternau, for the education of seven noble ladies, with a fund for ever, for the education of nearly eighty girls; with bountiful provision for the blind and deaf and dumb, and for poor artizans.

The cathedral of Cologne, one of the most magnificent Christian monuments in Germany, which has never been completed, is to be finished at the expense of the government. The original plan has fortunately been preserved, and the work will be wholly in conformity with the design of its first great architect. The direction has been entrusted to M. Schinker, the royal architect; and it is expected that the whole undertaking will be accomplished in eighteen months.

BELGIUM.—A royal decree of the 20th Aug., ordains that the sum of 45,000fs. shall be paid to Cardinal Sterckx, for the expenses of his installation; with an annual allowance of 30,000fs.

The want of hospitals and charitable institutions had been severely felt in the small towns of the kingdom; but, by the zeal of several excellent ecclesiastics, and the generous aid of the laity, this want has been, in a great measure, supplied. The town of Roulers has been enriched by the erection of two hospitals,—one for women, the other for the aged poor,—within the last few years. The former owes its existence to the zeal of the canon Nachtergaele; the other was built by the *Bureau de bienfaisance*, and has been placed under his care. The town of Iseghem has also built an asylum for the aged; the expenses, which exceed 30,000fs., have been defrayed by the commune and the charity of the faithful. M. Coevoet, a worthy ecclesiastic, has obtained from the government a grant of the site of the college at Poperinghen, for the erection of an hospital, for which large contributions have been already placed in his hands. M. Darras, curate of Thielt, has founded a similar establishment in that town; to him the commune of Ledeghen is also indebted for an hospital. M. De Beir, curate of Lendelede, has dedicated the whole of his rich patrimony to the foundation of an hospital for the aged. Another has been erected at Moorslede, by M. Verhelst, its curate; his successor, M. de Caeysele, has provided for the town of Clercken in like manner. Belleghem, by the charity of several pious individuals, possesses an asylum for eighty persons of both sexes: a few years before, a similar institution was formed at St. Genois by the canon Triest. Anseghem and the extensive parishes of Lichtervelde, Rumbeke, and Langbemarck, have been supplied with hospitals within the last four or five years. The government has granted 1200fs. to the hospital set on foot by M. Benoît, the curate of Merckem. The canon Nachtergaele, already mentioned, and M. Goddyn, the curate, have contributed to the endowment of another in the commune of Ardoye. M. Van Damme, curate of Ruysselede, who died in August 1837, has left by his will, 16,208fs. for an

hospital and school for the poor in that commune. M. Platteau, curate of Meulebeke, has made over all his property to the hospital, founded chiefly by his exertions; and the communes of Wacken and Pitthem have taken measures to erect an hospital for the sick and poor. When it is considered that all these charitable institutions, the list of which we copy from the excellent *Journal de Liège*, exist within the single diocese of Bruges, our readers will be able rightly to appreciate the justice of the encomiums bestowed by the Holy Father in the allocution quoted above, on the piety and religious spirit of the people of Belgium.

The jubilee of Our Lady of Hanswyck has been celebrated at Mechlin, with the most profuse magnificence. It commenced on the 15th of August; and the two first days were wholly dedicated to the services of religion. Twenty preachers were appointed to deliver instructions in Flemish and French, during the fortnight it lasted. On the 15th, the city was decorated with hangings and flowers, along the line of streets through which the procession was to pass: triumphal arches and temporary altars were erected in different places. The procession was led by a large detachment of *chasseurs* on horseback, attended by three bands, A foot-regiment formed the outer line: the students of the seminary, in surplices, and upwards of 200 persons bearing torches and the banners of the different parishes, preceded the image of Our Lady, borne by twelve men. The Virgin was seated on a throne, with a silver canopy above, and crowned with the rich diadem of brilliants presented by the ladies of Mechlin, and enveloped in a mantle of crimson velvet, embroidered over a robe of gold lama. She was attended by a number of young girls, representing the Virtues, the king and queen, the city of Mechlin, a group of confessors, and a choir of angels; and followed by *the Ship of Belgium*, containing St. Catherine, a captain, and fifteen mariners. The King and Queen of the Belgians came from Laecken, with four carriages and a large retinue, to witness the procession, and expressed their satisfaction at the beauty and order of the pageant, and the splendour of the decorations. The horses were supplied by the Minister of War, with dragoons to direct their movements; and the decorations were gratuitously furnished by the tradesmen.

ASIA.—A French paper (the *Semeur*) lately published an account given by Mr. Mehburst, of his missionary and biblical labours in China, where he lived twenty years; and endeavours to show from the number of Bibles distributed by him and by other members of the same society, that his success had been equally great. A correspondent of the *Univers*, gives the following explanation of the manner in which these biblical missionaries conducted their work of conversion:—"A Protestant journal, the *Semeur*, has lately published a detailed account of the report given by Mr. Mehburst, English Missionary at Batavia, to a numerous assemblage of persons, concerning his mission in China, followed by a rapid sketch of the labours of the English and American Missionaries. They have translated the Bible into Chinese, and have distributed in China, 2,000 Bibles, 10,000 copies of the New Testament, and 30,000 copies of extracts from the Scriptures. They have printed more than a hundred works on different subjects, and 750,009 religious tracts have been

scattered about by them. Mr. Mehburst has been very exact in giving the numbers of books translated or distributed by the English and American Missionaries, but he does not mention how this distribution was effected in places where they could not penetrate; what use the Chinese have made of all these Bibles, &c., or what fruits the reading of them has produced; but we happen to know from other sources, that in the places which they cannot enter, as in China, Corea, Formosa, and Japan, &c., they leave boxes of Bibles and tracts on the shore, without troubling themselves to inquire by whom these books will be picked up, whether they will be read, or what will be the result of the distribution. We know, moreover, that this mode of scattering Bibles, &c., has been the cause of an edict for persecuting the Christians in the maritime provinces of China. With regard to Cochin-China, the Bishop of Isauropolis, Vicar-Apostolic of that country, in a letter from Serampore, near Calcutta, dated the 18th of last January, mentions that a Cochin-Chinese Colonel is in chains for having brought into the country a box of books treating of the religion of Jesus.

“It appears,” says his Lordship, “that in one of his voyages to Singapore or its neighbourhood, he received this box from some Protestant minister, probably one of those belonging to the Bible Society. These gentlemen will take care to let the world know that they sent this cargo into Cochin-China, and as many books as there were in the box, so many converts will figure in their report—a lucky invention for multiplying converts in a short time and with little risk—not so lucky, however, for the poor Colonel, for besides the severe reprimand he has already received from the Emperor, it is thought that this despot, regardless of the zeal of the Americans, will sentence him to death.”

From a letter dated Macao, 17th Sept. 1837, we extract the following:—“Three doctors in medicine, dreaming of nothing but good, have just published a pamphlet, in which they describe the misery of those who know not Jesus Christ, the number of Chinese, who are in this situation, and the means of delivering them from it; which are, ‘all true believers are to concur with their money or their personal aid in conversion of the Chinese.’ The money so collected will go towards forming at Macao a society of missionary physicians, who, after a few years’ preparation in the college to be established for the society, will scatter themselves, like a swarm of bees, over China, carrying medicines for the body, and preaching the word of God for the good of the souls. Any one may become a member, without distinction of creed, Anglicans, Lutherans, Calvinists, Presbyterians, Quakers, Protestants, and even Catholics, may enter this college of physician-apostles. One of them has already followed the impulse of his zeal. Another Xavier has visited Tartary, Corea, Formosa, Japan, and Fokien. He embarks as interpreter in every vessel that sails to these countries, either to sell opium or to examine the tea-plantations, and has enriched every place he has touched at, with thousands of tracts, which he scatters with a generosity that plainly proves that they are not his own.”

The *Prussian State Gazette* gives the following letter from St. Petersburg, dated June 23:—“We learn by letters from Peking, where a mis-

sion has existed since the time of Peter the Great, that more than 300,000 Chinese have already embraced Christianity, and there is every reason to believe that the persecution against the Christians will shortly cease. The emperor has studied and reverences the Christian religion, although at his accession Christian blood was shed. The rigorous laws against Christians exist only upon paper, and mandarins favourable to them are alone charged with putting them in execution. The law of 1836 was directed solely against the English, whose political influence the emperor dreaded. There are in China several vicariats, whose chiefs are at Peking, Nankin, and Macao, and Christianity is gaining ground in the empire.

Two missionaries have lately embarked for China, MM. Lavoissière ; and one for Syria, M. Guiltat ; they are all from the diocese of Lyons, and have been educated at St. Lazarus. Three others from the seminary of the Foreign Missions embarked in April for India, and three more left the same establishment on the 16th of May, to embark at Bordeaux for China. On the preceding evening, they solemnly bade farewell to their companions and a large assembly of ecclesiastics and laymen. At nine o'clock, M. Langlois, the superior, after reciting the prescribed prayers, addressed the three missionaries, tracing from the recollections of his own long experience in the same career, the duties of their new and glorious mission, describing the comforts and the sorrows attending it. In conclusion, he declared to them that they were to fill the place of martyrs, and perhaps to receive, like their predecessors, the crown of martyrdom. At the end of the discourse, the persons assembled, with the superior at their head, respectfully and in deep silence kissed the feet of the young apostles.

A letter dated Macao, July 1837, and addressed to the superiors of the same seminary, mentions that two missionaries, MM. Marette and Cornay, had been seized in Tonkin. Hopes were entertained of obtaining the release of the former, by paying an enormous sum of money, before the information of his seizure should reach the sovereign ; but, as for the latter, Minh-Menh had already heard of his being in prison, and had ordered him to be conducted to the royal capital, where certain death awaited him. We have every reason to believe that the next tidings we shall receive will bring the account of his martyrdom. The cruelty of Minh-Menh is even directed against the members of his own family, and he has lately put his own brother to death, under the pretext that he favoured the late revolt, but in reality, through fear of being dethroned by him. But the justice of God is already felt, and his hand is heavy on the perpetrator of so many crimes. His two eldest sons have just died suddenly ; eighteen vessels laden with the tribute of the kingdom have been wrecked with all their cargo. One of the mandarins, the most ferocious enemy of our holy faith, was embarked in one of these vessels, and his body half eaten up by fishes has been found on the shore. Six other vessels belonging to the monarch went down in the port of Touranne, while a fire was raging in a house near the palace. In spite of the persecution, the number of those who have approached the sacraments or have embraced the faith, is nearly equal to that of the preceding year.

The Gazette of the Prince of Wales' Island (*Pulo Pinang*) of December 19, 1836, furnishes the following details respecting that mission :— "The English have been in possession of the island for about 40 years. The first missionary sent by Monsignor Garnault, Vicar-Apostolic of Siam, was M. Rectenwald, who died in 1822. He was succeeded by Father Pascal, a Siamese priest, and after his removal to another mission, by M. Pupier, who was also to assist in the direction of the Chinese college established in the island.* He applied himself with wonderful zeal to the work of converting the Chinese residing in the island; and had made such rapid progress, that in a short space of time he had baptized 71 adults and 25 children, born of infidel parents, at the point of death. He was remarkable for his humility, piety, and sweetness of disposition; travelled always on foot in spite of bad weather or night air, and gave instructions and spiritual comfort in every part of the island to his scattered flock, and assisted the sick and dying in the hospitals. His frame could not long support these unceasing labours, and he was prematurely carried off by death.

M. Boucho arrived in October 1824. His first care was to provide for the education and moral improvement of the lower classes in his flock. The difficulties that stood in his way would have been insurmountable to one less enterprising than himself. He succeeded in forming three schools, one at George Town, another at Burma Town, and the last at Glugore, in the interior of the island; and obtained 30 piastres a month from government for their support. Not content with this provision for the instruction of the lower classes in their own languages, Chinese, Malay, and Indian Portuguese, he saw the want, in an English possession, in which many of the native Christians were employed in government offices as writers and interpreters, of an English school, in which he could watch over their conduct, and instil into them the maxims and duties of religion. The Vicar-Apostolic of Siam had felt this want in 1818, but the difficulties of the undertaking prevented him from putting his intentions in execution. M. Boucho, by his firm and persevering zeal, founded a free-school for boys, near the chapel: he met with much opposition from the jealousy of certain individuals, but the number of scholars soon exceeded a hundred, and Mr. Fullerton, the governor, granted him a hundred piastres per month for an establishment so highly beneficial to the colony. An estimate may be formed of the advantages of the schools and the labours of the Catholic missionaries, when it is known that within the last six years, 759 Chinese adults have been converted to Christianity, exclusive of many others belonging to the other nations that inhabit the island. At Battoukawan, a district about sixteen miles from Penang, in the province of Wellesley, a number of Chinese, flying from the troubles of their own country, had established a colony, and subsisted by the cultivation of the sugar cane. Their manner of life was so turbulent and intractable, that the police could hardly succeed in keeping them within bounds. M. Boucho went often amongst them, and in the end succeeded in gaining their confidence. They attended his instructions; he

* See Dr. Wiseman's *Lectures on the Principal Doctrines, &c.* vol. ii. p. 240, *Note*.

founded a school amongst them in June 1830, and converted eighty of them, who became peaceable, industrious, and exemplary subjects. To encourage this mission, Mr. Fullerton, at his request, granted him a piece of land for a chapel, which he erected by the aid of a few friends, and placed there a Chinese Catechist, with a salary of 14 rupees per month. His next grand object was to procure the establishment of a school for the education of girls, and their instruction in the doctrines of religion, as well as in the arts of female household duties. Although unsuccessful in his petition for aid from the government, he appealed to the generosity of the Catholic and Protestant inhabitants of the island. His appeal was well received, and a sum of upwards of 2,000 rupees was collected. The school contains 36 boarders and 20 day scholars, and its establishment has been followed by the most happy results. For his own support, M. Boucho bought some rice grounds, the produce of which, with the alms of a few friends, suffices for his wants. In conclusion, the paper warmly commends the zeal, charity, and laborious life of the missionary.

CATHOLIC MISSION IN NEW ZEALAND.—(*From the Australian.*)
Statement of Mr. Thomas Poynton, a resident at Hokianga, in New Zealand, March 12, 1838.

“On the arrival of the Right Rev. Dr. Pompalier in Hokianga, that reverend prelate met with great opposition from a Mr. Turner, a preacher, situated on the river. Mr. Turner was not contented with preaching against the Catholic religion and its ministers on Sundays, and laying it down as black and idolatrous as his eloquence could paint—but he must carry his malice farther. He represented to the natives that the bishop, or his priest, could be no good, as they were Frenchmen; that all from their country were murderers, and that if they were allowed to stop in New Zealand, in the course of time Dr. Pompalier would burn them (the natives) at a stake, if they did not adhere to the Catholic religion. On the 17th day of January, Mr. Turner sent about fifty natives to my house, to send by force from this river the Catholic bishop; they demanded to see the bishop, the bishop came out accordingly; they then spoke to me, as the bishop did not understand them, and they ordered him from New Zealand, and demanded his wooden gods that they might throw them into the tide.

“It was time for me then to speak, when I saw they were determined to do something that was not just; but I soon convinced them it was the best thing they could do, not to meddle with me or the Catholic ministers; they thought so themselves, and were soon satisfied, and told me that it was Mr. Turner who sent them, or that they should not come to trouble the bishop or his priest;—but that I knew what Mr. Turner’s intentions were towards the Catholic missionaries, and for me to take such means as lay in my power to prevent Mr. Turner from sending them by native force from Hokianga.

“I went down to Mr. Turner on that same day, to know by what right, or by what authority, he should send a party of natives to my place, to interrupt any person that might be there; he, Mr. Turner, denied having sent the natives to my house, but told me he would oppose the Catholic

religion and its clergy, as far as talk would go, but would not advise insult or persecution:

“ I represented to Mr. Turner, what he might expect from the just indignation of forty or fifty British Catholics, if he persisted in persecuting the ministers of their Church ; that we, as Catholics, were allowed the free exercise of our religion in Great Britain and Ireland, and should be so, by right, in a free independent country. I reminded him of the ill-advised plans to the natives, which caused them to slaughter one another ; and that not many months back, I was an eye-witness, as were ten Englishmen, to the complete slaughter of sixteen or eighteen natives, by what they style Christian natives. I told Mr. Turner, that if he commenced such work, that it would not be easy to put a stop to it ; that I had the Europeans on my side, which was a match for what natives he could muster, and not to mention the natives that would take our part, and that would be the greatest number. I moreover told him, that I would make an appeal to the Protestants on the river, and at the Bay of Islands, to judge his conduct, in persecuting two men that never wronged him, and were strangers alike to his language and the language of the natives ; that they were alike incapable of defending themselves in the English or New Zealand language.

“ I advised peace and good-will, as it would be the only way to benefit the natives, which each of them, the Catholic missionaries, seemed to be sent from home to preach, and not to raise dissensions and quarrels, that might terminate in their destruction, and cause a good deal of bloodshed on both sides.

“ Mr. Turner told me that all the blame should be to me, as he was informed that I was the cause of the Catholic clergy coming to New Zealand ; that he and his family were safe—that Catholicism was the worst of all religions, and particularly in New Zealand—that it had great attractions for the natives—that he (Turner) was well aware that the poor natives would be allured over to that religion by the splendour of their Church and vestments—that it suited them. ‘ But, Poynton,’ said he, addressing me, ‘ you know that we call all that adhere to the Roman Catholic religion idolators.’—‘ Well,’ I said, ‘ there is no cause of quarrel on that point, for you know that we are not idolators, but you are heretics ;’—so we departed with a good understanding. Of course, he was determined to drive the bishop and his priest out of New Zealand—and I was determined to keep them, or perish in the attempt. I made an appeal to all the respectable Protestants on the Hokianga River, and to most of them at the Bay of Islands, to know if they would sanction or allow Turner to carry on his persecution against the Catholic bishop ; and to their credit they said, to a man, that they would be the first to oppose Turner, and protect the bishop with their lives, and observed that it was a good thing that the Catholic missionaries came ; that it might cause the others to mind that for which they left home, for most of them forgot what they were before they came to New Zealand, or for what purpose they arrived here. The Bible was now only used as a mask for traffic ; and in our poor, meek, and humble English missionary, we soon have him transformed into a complete New Zealand merchant, with the important ignorant pride of a county magis-

trate. Oh ! their conduct here but ill suits the purpose for which they have been sent—and they call themselves Apostles of the Gospel. Oh ! how different from the first Apostles of Christ's Church ; they have their wives and children, their cows and horses, their houses and land, and live in the greatest plenty. This was the general remark.

“ But to resume. There was not a chief in Hokianga of any consequence, that Turner did not use his influence with, to see if they would drive the Catholic bishop from New Zealand, all to no purpose. Some would have nothing to do with it ; and they that would, were afraid or overruled by those possessed of more power than themselves. But there was one more chance remained to be tried by Turner. This was a very influential chief that was from home ; and he (Turner) made no doubt but when this man came back, that he would execute his purpose. This man came back ; Turner spoke to him to put the Catholic bishop from New Zealand, but, to his utmost surprise, Neany made him this answer :—‘ No ! I will not go ; do it yourself, if you think you can, or if you think the white men will allow you : as for me, I will have nothing to do in quarrelling with the white men ; I never did, nor will I now.’ So ended this much-loved persecution. He is at great pains to disown having spoken to the natives to put away the bishop ; but the natives proved it to his face, that he sent them to my house to drive the bishop and priest from New Zealand, and to break their service for the altar. The Catholics during this debate behaved with good conduct and prudence ; they came every Sunday with their families to Mass ; those Catholics that lived with native women, all of them have got married, and got their wives and children baptized. The natives are quite surprised to see so many white men going to Mass, when none go to Turner's preaching—men to whom the missionaries gave the name of devils. When the natives would ask, what was the reason that they never came to hear him preach, he would say that they had no religion—that they were devils ; but now the natives see that those devils, as they were called, have a religion, and attend to the same.

“ The natives are surprised to see so many white men go to Mass on Sunday, and that none, with the exception of two or three at most, go to the preaching of Turner, and conclude that the Catholic religion is the right one ; and many of the chiefs said to me, that only for being baptized in the Wesleyan Church, they would be Catholics ; that they are ashamed to turn from it now ; but that they can see that Turner wanted to drive the bishop from New Zealand for fear that they would all turn to him.

“ The bishop went to Widdenacy, situated about fourteen miles from my place, on the river Hokianga (the natives on this river never would listen to Turner's preaching) ; I spoke to some Catholics to go with the bishop, which they did, in three boats ; this was another insight to the natives. When we arrived at the settlement, and the bishop went on shore, their first exclamation was, ‘ Oh ! that is the right missionary, and he looks like the right one ; we will have him, and listen to him.’ I was on the spot when these words were spoken. We stopped all night ; and the next morning, when the bishop put on his vestments to

read Mass, I never before witnessed such surprise : they all consented to be of his flock. On another river, called Ollani, they also wish to belong to the Catholic faith : twelve or fourteen of the principal men of that river, were at Mass at my house several times.

“ This week, the bishop was sent for by two of the most powerful chiefs of the Hokianga ; they and their people are about to embrace the Catholic faith. There is another tribe called Isutiyes ; the best part of them attend every Sunday. I trust in God, before many months expire, that we will have more Catholic natives on this river than what the Wesleyans will have, as all those natives that have not turned to the Wesleyan preachers, are determined to embrace our religion.

“ His lordship has got on well in learning the English language, since his arrival in this country ; so much so, that he can hear confessions ; he labours hard in learning the English and New Zealand languages ; the latter comes easy to him to articulate, and he will not be long in learning it. Sometimes he is up most part of the night, and very often all night : he has a great deal to do, but he is fit to accomplish it ; he is just the man for it. Oh ! what a blessing for us all to have such a man ! so meek, so humble, and devout : he is a saintly man ! May the great God grant him health and long life to accomplish his great undertaking.”

AMERICA.—M. Caret, whose zeal has been so conspicuous in the Gambier Islands, in spite of the opposition of the sectarian minister, who has gained such an ascendancy over the mind of the monarch, has returned to Valparaiso with four priests and three lay-brothers. Twelve sisters of the convent of Picpus accompanied them, for the purpose of founding a school in Valparaiso. As a sequel to the persecutions which he and other French missionaries have suffered from the English Evangelicals in the Sandwich Islands, as we have already mentioned, we give the following act of proscription from the *Sandwich Islands' Gazette* ; from the style of which, our readers will at once recognise the source whence it proceeded :—“ Strangers from every country, who are now dwelling in the possessions subject to my dominion, hear my words that you may obey my commands.

“ The Frenchmen whom Kaahumanu has banished, shall remain under the dominion of the law which exiled them.

“ The expulsion of these men is possible, and I confirm it this day in the fullest manner. I will no longer tolerate their stay in my kingdom.

“ Such are my orders respecting them, and I ordain that they shall instantly repair on board of the vessels which brought them, or of others in which they can await the moment of departure from my kingdom. This appears clear to me ; but, to their longer stay in this place, I can by no means consent.

“ I will not allow the service of missionaries who obey the Pope to be continued in my kingdom, on any account whatsoever.

“ Consequently, all those who shall encourage the papist missionaries, I shall consider as my personal enemies, and the enemies of my advisers, of my chiefs, and of my kingdom.

By KAMEHAMEA III.”

The captivity of the French missionaries, in consequence of these orders of the government, did not last long. The captain of the French frigate *Venus*, speedily put an end to all controversial questions about the merits of the Catholic religion, by declaring that, as the honour of France was compromised by the detention of French subjects, he would consider the government of the island responsible for the measures adopted respecting them. This method of cutting short an ascetic discussion with the cannon of a sixty-gun frigate, has secured the peaceable stay of the missionaries of the faith in the Oceanic Archipelago.

Four Spanish Franciscans, with a priest at their head, embarked a few weeks ago at Cette for Buenos Ayres. Five or six others are shortly to follow.

Monsignor Rezè, Bishop of Détroit, returned in the month of June to his diocese with two priests. His commission from the Holy Father, on behalf of the *Propagation de la Foi*, induced him to visit Naples, Vienna, and Munich, where he was most graciously received by the different princes and ministers, who warmly promised to promote the interests of the association.

Seven missionaries from St. Lazarus, left Paris in the beginning of August, on their way to embark for America, in order to found an establishment in the diocese of New Orleans,—probably at Donaldsonville.

AFRICA.—A bishoprick has been erected by His Holiness for the French possessions in Africa, with the title of Bishop of Algiers. He is to be nominated by the King of France, and to receive canonical institution, of course, from the Pope.

A Catholic church has been erected at Tunis. M. Raffo, one of the Bey's ministers, was the first on the list of subscribers, to the amount of 16,000 francs. The generosity of the European merchants, and of the native Christians, and the zeal of Father Louis, the apostolic prefect, furnished the means for finishing the work. The consecration took place on the 31st of December. The flags of the different nations were displayed at the residences of the consuls; and in the afternoon, the consuls of all the Catholic nations repaired to the Church, attended by all the officers of their consulates. The Father Prefect carried the Blessed Sacrament, under a canopy supported by several merchants. After vespers, he addressed the benefactors, applauding their zeal, and congratulating them on the completion of the work. At the conclusion of his discourse, the *Te Deum* was chanted, and the benediction of the Blessed Sacrament closed the ceremony. To these triumphs of the faith in Africa, we may add the following account from a letter from Constantinople:—"On the feast of Corpus Christi, a splendid procession set out from the French Church of St. Benedict, and after passing through the streets of Galata, entered the Church of the Armenian Catholics. The priests of the neighbouring Greek Church, in their sacerdotal habits, paid their devotions to the Holy Sacrament. On this occasion, a spirit of union and tolerance was observed among the members of the different communions, from which one might be inclined to believe in the possibility of a union of religions."

CUMBERLAND, *Penrith*.—The circumstance of Penrith being, as it were, the head-quarters of those who resort to the Lakes, (being only five miles from the romantic Lake of Ullswater,) gives to this mission a plea of peculiar usefulness. Unfortunately, however, the congregation is so extremely poor, that unless a generous Catholic public assist with their charitable contributions, the establishment of the mission on a suitable footing will be impossible; at present, there is almost a total want of requisites for the use of the altar. The building used as a chapel is too small for the congregation—extremely damp, and every way most inconvenient. The entrance to it is through the churchyard; and the poor Catholics are taunted, as they go to mass, with the poverty of their place of worship. By the generosity of H. Howard, Esq., of Corby Castle, an eligible plot of ground has been purchased for the erection of a new chapel; and it is most confidently hoped, that all true lovers of their religion will prove, by their contributions to this mission, that the Catholics of this day are animated by the same truly religious spirit which caused their ancestors to erect those magnificent structures to religion, which, though now no longer of use to their descendants, continue to attest their faith and piety. There is no school attached to the mission; a subject of the greatest distress to the pastor, who sees the children of his flock exposed to the contagion of all kinds of vice and bad example, without having any sufficient means for their rescue. Donations will be thankfully received by the Right Rev. Dr. Briggs, Fulford House, near York; the Very Rev. R. Thomson Weldbank, Chorley; P. H. Howard, Esq. M.P. Corby Castle, near Carlisle; and by the Rev. J. Fielding Whitaker, pastor of the congregation.

SUMMARY REVIEW OF FRENCH CATHOLIC LITERATURE, *From March to September 1838.*

To the periodical works mentioned in our former notices of French literature, which attest the reviving and rapidly increasing interest of the reading public in religious information and literature, we have to add three others of more modest pretensions, which have lately begun to appear. The first of these, entitled *L'Anti-Protestant*, is directed against the Bible Societies, and the efforts of their emissaries in France, over the "unfruitful and ungrateful" soil of which, the societies of Paris and London have scattered tracts and Bibles in every direction. We have lately heard that, from the windows of a diligence travelling in the north of France, one of the members, in the fulness of his zeal, threw bundles of them on the road; while one of their ministers could find no better opportunity for distributing them, than the moment when a party of persons were returning from the funeral of one of their friends. Against such proselytism as this, the journal we have mentioned is expressly established. The other two are, the *Clochette Catholique*, a journal appearing twice a month (20fr. per an.) and intended for the instruction of the lower classes; and the *Ange Gardien*, published once a month (4fr. per an.), by a society whose members have already acquired a distinguished reputation for their exertions on behalf of

the rising generation. In this small periodical, they propose to treat subjects connected with history, the duties of children, &c., in a manner adapted to the capacities of children. Although not strictly within our province, we are happy to announce that a periodical, entitled *Godsdienstig geschieden letterkundig tydschrift*, (Journal of religion, history, and literature) has been established at the Hague, by several zealous and excellent clergymen. The two first numbers, published in the beginning of the present year, contain a sketch of the religious condition and ecclesiastical divisions of Holland. From this publication, as well as from the reports given by it of the state of religion, we are led to augur the happiest results. We hope, at no distant period, to be able to furnish our readers with a full account of the state of Catholic literature in that kingdom.

LITURGY, DEVOTION, AND INSTRUCTION.

Esprit des Cérémonies de l'Eglise, par M. L. Abbé Chirat, 1 vol. 12mo.—When Durand composed his *Rationale Divinorum Officiorum*, he even then complained of the remissness of the clergy in explaining the rites of the Church to the faithful. Compared with the activity of the fourteenth, fifteenth, and sixteenth centuries, in investigating and explaining rites, the apathy of succeeding times presents a mournful contrast. Liturgy once occupied a place in the regular courses in the schools of France; and at Rome, the ancient custom still prevails. Happily, this taste has revived with the regenerated spirit of religion in the former country. The volume we announce, though not distinguished by profound learning, has still a high claim to esteem on the score of general utility. It is meant for the use of the faithful, and, within a narrow compass, comprises a sufficiently ample and detailed account of the ceremonies of the Church. It is divided into five parts: the first is devoted to the explanation of the ceremonies used in the administration of the sacraments; the second, after a few chapters on the sacrifices of the ancients, and the sacrifice of the new law, the temples, altars, sacred vessels, and vestments, gives an explanation of the prayers and ceremonies of the Mass; in the third part, the author treats of the divine office, and gives a translation and explanation of vespers and complin. The particular ceremonies of the Sundays and festivals of the year, occupy the fourth part; and the fifth comprises the forms of benediction and consecration employed in the Church. Each point is first treated historically; the spiritual signification of the ceremonies is next explained; and lastly, their moral application. The style of the work is unpretending, clear, and simple, and occasionally elegant.

Les Louanges de Marie, par S. Bernard; *Homélies en l'Honneur de la Mère de Dieu*, par M. l'Abbé Dufour. 1 vol. 12mo. If devotion to the Blessed Virgin reached so high a pitch during the twelfth century, the Church owed this blessing to the ardent and tender piety of the Abbot of Clairvaux. "It is certain," says M. Dufour, in his preface, "that the cause of this expansion of piety, was the eloquent and persuasive voice of St. Bernard, in those words of ineffable sweetness, in those mystic canticles, in which he celebrates the glory, the tenderness, the immense compassion, of Her who united heaven and earth, time and

eternity." The homilies of St. Bernard are not, in general, the best productions of his genius; they are deficient both in developement and depth: those, however, which treat of the Blessed Virgin, must be excepted. These are distinguished above all the rest for rich and elevated thoughts and views, and for warmth and splendour of diction. The name of Mary touched this great doctor with a spell that was all powerful; his reflections no sooner turned upon what humanity owes to the Mother of God, than his heart melted, and his lips flowed with a sweet eloquence. With this theme he loved to entertain the religious who were under him: this theme he pursued in writing, when his tongue failed him. The praises of our Blessed Lady, therefore, occupy a large space in St. Bernard's works. Besides set panegyrics, each feast has one or two homilies, or even more. Having to select from among these, M. Dufour has chosen for translation such as have the Blessed Virgin for their special object, and those in which the mysteries of her life are treated. His collection comprises eight homilies and one panegyric, which contain whatever is most important to piety or eloquence in the holy doctor's writings on this subject. The translation unites the qualities of ease and strength. It was no easy task to render with fidelity the text of St. Bernard, sometimes exceedingly diffuse, and often concise beyond imitation. These difficulties are ably surmounted; and we hope the translator's success will induce him to cull some other flowers of this kind from the pages of the fathers. His present work is eminently qualified to promote that piety now-a-days, which his great original was so successful in kindling.

Livre de Première Communion.—Par M. l'Abbé Bossuet.—The title of this book is alone sufficient to excite interest and conciliate favour. The period of our first communion, an act which often strongly influences our subsequent career, is a precious moment, to which the soul reverts, in after years, with pleasure and affection. We could illustrate what we here allege, from celebrated writers, but we content ourselves with Victor Hugo's testimony, as to the importance of a first communion: "I feel," said he, after witnessing his daughter's first communion, "that where this great religious act is wanting, the heart is not perfectly formed nor the soul complete." The contents of this little work do not disappoint the impression conveyed by its title. It is divided into three parts; the first containing prayers and devotional exercises; the second, sentiments and reflections; the third, resolutions and a rule of life. Hence, its utility is not confined to the period for which it is particularly destined; it may serve as a guide during life.

Le Ciel Ouvert.—This work, which is from the pen of a missionary, M. l'Abbé Favre, proves the necessity of sincerity in confession, and the advantages of frequent communion. The work is enlivened by examples judiciously selected from the lives of the Saints, which illustrate the writer's argument. A book which at first seems to promise but serious reading, is thus rendered entertaining. It is rare to meet with ascetic works composed in this manner, yet such we venture to think should be the nature of those, at least, which are designed for popular instruction. The author, we regret to say, has just left the scene of his earthly labours, for that heaven which he had contemplated with the eyes of faith.

Népotien, ou le Jeune Elève du Sanctuaire.—Nepotian was a holy priest, whom St. Jerome directed in spiritual affairs, and to whom he addressed a letter full of admirable counsels and instructions, concerning the priestly character. The work under the above title, is a commentary upon this letter, but a commentary well worthy of the text by which it stands, and one which will be highly appreciated by all who can estimate the difficulty of giving to such as are destined for the priesthood, wise and solid precepts to direct their conduct, both while at college and during their missionary labours.

Plan d'un Examen de Conscience motivé.—Par M. Vuarin, Curé de Genève, 18mo.—This work has been approved by the Archbishop of Amasia, Administrator of the Diocese of Lyons; indeed, the name of the author is a sufficient recommendation. M. Vuarin has already distinguished himself by his former writings, as well as by the pastoral zeal displayed by him in the arduous post he has filled for nearly thirty years. The first part of the present work is a dogmatical treatise on Confession, wherein the author enlarges on the wisdom, utility, and divine institution of this sacrament.

M. Vion, Canon and Archpriest of the Cathedral of Strasbourg, has published, at the pressing instances of his friends, five discourses against modern Rationalism, delivered by him during last Lent. The following is a brief analysis of them. In the first, the preacher begins by showing that out of the religion of Jesus Christ there is no salvation for mankind, degraded by the primeval fall. The consequences of this original transgression, entailed upon posterity, are ignorance, concupiscence, and the sense of guilt or sting of conscience. God, moved to pity for humanity suffering from these miseries, sent his only Son to repair the moral order which sin had broken and disturbed. Jesus Christ, therefore, came to discharge a triple function; to enlighten reason clouded by ignorance concerning the truths of salvation; to correct the will depraved by concupiscence; and lastly, by satisfying the Divine justice, to efface our guilt, and restore calm to conscience. This threefold object he completely accomplished. He revealed a religion which comprises all truths necessary to salvation, a religion stamped with the seal of divinity, destined to be universal and perpetual, and to spread its influence over all mankind to the end of ages. The second discourse unfolds the perfect moral system based upon the love of God and of our neighbour. This morality Jesus Christ enforced by the urgent motives which faith suggests, by his own example and by a promise of supernatural succours to render its practice easy. The third dwells upon our Saviour's quality as Messiah and representative of guilty humanity, and explains his sacrifice upon the Cross. The fourth shows how Christ, to render the benefits of redemption universal, established a spiritual but visible and permanent society. He delegated to its heads his triple office of instructing, correcting, and sanctifying mankind; and for this end invested them with his own authority, and promised "to abide with them to the end of the world." The announcement of this religion by his disciples, its propagation in the face of obstacles from persecution, a brief detail of the combats of the Church with her enemies, and of her triumphs from the

first ages till now, form the subject of the fifth and concluding discourse. The publication of these discourses is signal service to the cause of truth, against modern sophists.

Conférences spirituelles d'une Supérieure à ses Religieuses, 1 vol. 12mo.—These conferences were found in a manuscript of Madame de Beauvilliers, who reformed the religious of the convent of Montmartre, over which she was appointed abbess at the early age of twenty-four years, in 1598. She found the convent in a state of great disorder, the rules neglected, and the revenues impaired. By her zeal and firmness she overcame every difficulty, and had the comfort of seeing order and piety restored in the convent, before her death. These conferences contain instructions suitable to religious communities; a commentary on the rule of St. Benedict; discourses for Advent, Lent, and the different festivals of the year. The manuscript, which has too long been neglected, has been published by M. Gaudreau, curate of Vaugirard.

L'Athée redevenu Chrétien, 1 vol. 8vo. 4 fr.—M. Delauro-Dubez, counsellor at the royal court of Montpellier, had long lived in a state of irreligion. The account of his conversion is given in the following graphic terms:—"I had lived without religion till my sixty-fourth year, although I had, in my own family, models of every Christian virtue, and a number of relatives who led an exemplary life. My profession fixed me at Montpellier, at a time when irreligious doctrines were the ruling opinions. Who could have predicted that my reason, till then so haughty, would humble itself so far as to adore, with an humble faith, the mysteries so impenetrably obscure—the stumbling block of human wisdom—when I had grown old in the habit of looking on them as the baubles of superstition. Towards the end of the year after my change of residence, I was accustomed to enjoy solitary walks in the neighbourhood of Montpellier. During one of these rambles, my thoughts were borne, I know not how, to the days of my infancy and boyhood. I recalled with delight that period of innocence and happiness, the care, the endearments, and the affectionate solicitude of the tenderest of mothers, to keep far from me the seductions of evil. Oh! how dear to my heart was the remembrance of the chief actions of her meritorious life, consecrated, till her eighty-fourth year, to deeds of charity and benevolence! With what lively emotions was I filled, when memory brought back to me her sweet and ever unruffled temper; her open, engaging, and lively character, which added new charms to her virtue, and caused it to be loved by the coldest hearts; her daily visits to the hospitals and prisons; and her industrious zeal in discovering those dark and sorrowful abodes which hide the heart-rending miseries of the bashful poor.

"I saw her scattering comforts amongst all, drying up their tears, supplying their wants, relieving their sorrows. I saw her in the public places, in the streets, and even in her chamber, surrounded by the poor, who ran to her as to their mother; she forgot herself to relieve them, and distributed to them her clothes and the food destined for her family. What modesty, what recollection in the churches! what

solid, simple, and ever amiable piety ! In the last years of her life, she could not leave her house, on account of her infirmities. Her hands, though weakened by age, were occupied in making clothes for the poor, and even in sewing the tatters brought to her for their children. How sweet, O my most beloved mother, were those tears which the remembrance of the virtues practised by you on earth, caused me to shed ! But when I looked back to myself, what an afflicting contrast overwhelmed my soul ! Remorse plunged my heart in bitterness ; it told me that there existed a supreme Justice beyond this earth. Mournful feelings overcame my soul. ‘ O tenderest of mothers, shall it be true that that eternity of happiness with which you so often cheered my younger days, shall even now become a reality for you, while my rash opinions shall condemn me to be for ever separated from you ? Shall I be compelled for ever to blaspheme and curse that God who has recompensed your deserts with a boundless happiness ? ’ Wholly absorbed in these reflections, I had, without perceiving it, approached the church of the seminary. As if despite myself, I fell upon my knees before the grating which separates the vestibule from the interior, and I exclaimed, ‘ O God of my mother ! if it be true that you exist ; if you, as she has assured me, are the sovereign truth, wisdom, and goodness ; if you have made me for yourself, and will listen to the sincere desires of a sorrowing heart ; I conjure and implore you to employ your power in assisting me ; show yourself to your creature ; be his light and life ; trace out the way by which he may come to you ! ’ My agitation was extreme ; my tears flowed abundantly ; after a few seconds, I felt that my mind was again at peace, and I rose with the resolution of seeking truth in earnest sincerity.”

The reading of St. Augustine’s Confessions, and other books, perfected his conversion ; and in the work before us, he has recorded the arguments by which Atheism, Deism, and Protestantism were successively overcome, and he was led to the pure and blessed light of the Catholic faith. Every reasonable man must believe in God ; every believer must be a Christian ; every Christian must be a Catholic. These principles are the summary of the entire work, which is written in a clear and forcible style, well adapted to the importance of the subject, and the reasoning employed in its illustration. After the author’s death, in 1829, the MS. was shown to several persons, and one of the first fruits of it was the conversion of a Polish officer, who is now translating it into his own language. The profits of the work are applied to a charitable institution.

Conformité de la Religion Chrétienne avec les besoins et la nature de notre Cœur.—The various proofs which establish the truth of Christianity, are not equally convincing to all. Some men, and perhaps the greater number, *feel* better than they *reason*, and are guided by the heart more than by the understanding. To such as these the above work is principally addressed ; yet those also who delight in exercising the reasoning faculty, will find ample entertainment in the clear and solid demonstrations which the author deduces from the relations which

necessarily subsist between religion and the legitimate desires of the human heart.

Nécessité de la Religion par rapport à la tranquillité des états, à l'ordre des familles, et au bonheur des particuliers. Par M. l'Abbé Thomas. 1 vol. 18mo.—The style of this book is neat and perspicuous; the matter full and instructive; and the truth of the three propositions announced in the title, is clearly established. The notes, which form an appendix, explain and corroborate the truths mentioned in the body of the work; and they are rendered more valuable by being *classified*, so as to form of themselves a distinct work. The book is interesting in a typographical point of view, being printed by the poor children of the establishment of St. Nicholas, and is *got up* with considerable neatness.

PHILOSOPHY, HISTORY, AND BIOGRAPHY.

Conférences philosophiques sur la Religion.—These conferences are in the form of dialogues, in which are introduced, as interlocutors, the Abbé Gua de Malves, Bouguer, D'Alembert, and Euler. D'Alembert, who denied all save mathematical certainty, is forced to yield to the arguments of Euler. The Abbé, who was, in the opinion of Condorcet himself, "*un homme dangereux*," joined to a remarkable talent for analysis a profound and philosophic mind. Bouguer was a learned mathematician, who lived in the principles of D'Alembert, but was converted before his death. His conversion is the *denouement* of these conferences, in which the author has endeavoured to show the accordance of reason with faith. The undertaking is praiseworthy, and, we think, has been ably executed.

Histoire des Papes depuis S. Pierre jusqu'à nos jours.—Par M. Beaufort. 4 vols. 8vo. In numbers, each 60c. With an introduction by M. Laurentie. This work is published by the *Société Bibliographique*.

Histoire de la Compagnie de Jésus. Par E. de Tarrion. In numbers, each 50c.

Vie de Sainte Colette, reformatrice des Clarisses.—This life, it appears, was composed at the close of the last century, though not printed till lately. The saint died in 1447.

Vie nouvelle de Henri-Marie de Boudon, grand-Archidiacre d'Evreux.—8vo. This work has the merit of being exact; the author has studied the life of Boudon, has arranged the facts in their proper order, and suppressed some details related by Collet, which were not sufficiently authenticated.

De Prosecutione Operis Bollandiani quod Acta Sanctorum inscribitur.—We hail with joy this harbinger of the great and important work of the continuation of the venerable labours of the Bollandists. In the present prospectus, the fathers charged with the publication of the rest of the lives of the Saints, trace out the difficulties of their undertaking, and give a rapid sketch of the labours of their predecessors, and an account of the dispersion of the manuscript and printed books collected by them. At the period of the suppression of the Society of Jesus, their house

was seized as a military school, and their books were hastily packed up in boxes, to be carried to Brussels. In 1778, a report was presented respecting the state of their affairs to the government, which was anxious to retrace its own rash steps in interrupting the work. As, however, the affair went no farther, and the sale of the books seemed to be resolved upon, the Maurist monks and the ministers of Louis XVI made several attempts to purchase them for France; but the States of Flanders and several abbeys in Belgium strenuously resisted this shameful alienation. Godfrey Hermans, Abbot of Tongerlo, of the order of Premonstratenses, gave an exorbitant price for these precious monuments, which Joseph II had refused to preserve for Belgium, and continued the work at his own expense. But the invasion and ravages of the French army in 1794 arrested its progress, and a part of the books was carried into Westphalia, another part was concealed, but a very great number of them were changed, or irrecoverably lost. In 1825, the printed books were in part adjudged to the Royal Library at the Hague, and in part sold at Antwerp. In 1827 the remaining MSS. were united to the Bourgoyne Library at Brussels. Notwithstanding these misfortunes, hopes had been from time to time entertained of persons being appointed, and means furnished, to continue the work. In 1801, 1803, and 1810, reports were ordered by the French government on the subject, but no farther measures were taken. Our readers have been already informed that some time back a society was formed in France to resume the work, and that the government of Belgium, justly proud of the honour that country had gained by it in former times, applied to the members of the Society of Jesus to undertake its continuance, as the rightful heirs and successors of the labours and glory of the Bollandists; with an understanding that grants of money for the purpose would be voted by the chambers. With the approbation of their superiors the fathers in Belgium consented to the proposal, and the prospectus before us is the first fruit of their labours. To it are attached the names of the four fathers on whom the chief portion of the commission has devolved, John Baptist Boone, Joseph Vandermoere, Prosper Coppens, and Joseph Vanbecke. It contains a list of *four thousand* saints, most of whose festivals occur between the 15th of October, where their predecessors were interrupted, and the 31st of December. They invite all men of letters to assist them, by furnishing them with the old martyrologies of the religious orders, ecclesiastical calendars and directories, the offices peculiar to particular dioceses, manuscript lives of saints, —especially, if they are the works of writers contemporary with the events and persons described, local histories of cities, provinces, or monasteries; accounts of the translations of relics, or of the institution of confraternities in honour of the saints; and any other information which will throw light on their undertaking. If these cannot be directly communicated, it will be sufficient to furnish an exact description of them; or, if the owners entertain doubts respecting the utility of certain works to the fathers, they will be ready to answer any enquiries that may be addressed to them. The theme is noble and the enterprise vast and arduous; but, if an augury may be taken from these beginnings, the last portion bids fair to rival that which has gone before. The appeal which has been made to the

literary world, will, we trust, be promptly responded to by the lovers of biography and history; while the cause of religion and piety is interested in the speedy completion of the work. The public and private libraries and collections of MSS. in this country, contain rich and abundant materials, to which, we hope, the attention of the compilers will be directed; that the edifying and generous virtue of our forefathers may occupy its due rank among the lives of those who have illustrated the Church by their virtues and miracles.

SUMMARY REVIEW OF ITALIAN CATHOLIC LITERATURE,
From May to September 1838.

THEOLOGY AND LITURGY.

Besides a new edition of the large work of Devoti on Canon Law, which is but little known in this country, a series of charts or tables is publishing at Rome, in which the institutions of that learned and laborious author are classified and arranged under distinct heads and subdivisions. The editor has spent a whole year in supplying the references and authorities which were omitted in the original; these he has added in the charts, so that, besides a clear view of the principles and canons of the Church, the reader is presented at the same time with the books and decrees of Popes or Councils on which they are grounded. The cheapness of the work is an additional recommendation (7fr. for the whole series).

Juris Canonici Institutiones ad usum Seminarii Bugellensis, auctoritate Reverendissimi Episcopi editæ.—1 vol. 8vo. pp. 180. Bugellæ.

Istituzioni di Morale Teologia, ossia breve e facile metodo per apprendere le necessarie cognizioni di essa, e con pari facilità richiamarle alla memoria.—Del prete Raffaele Brandeglio. 3 vols. 12mo. Lucca.

Compendium Theologiæ Universæ, ad usum Examinatorum.—Auctore P. Thomas ex Charmes. Venetiis. 4to. pp. 184.

Ethicæ Christianæ, sive Theologiæ moralis compendium. Auctore F. Joanne Paluzzi. Laude Pompeia. 4 vols. 8vo.

In the department of Christian Antiquities we are happy to announce that a new edition is about to appear of the learned and elaborate compilation of Mamachi, which has long formed the text-book and guide of the student and antiquarian. It is to be published at the expense of the Chevalier Mouttinho-Lima, ambassador from Brazil to the Holy Sec.

Bibliotheca Liturgica. Studio P. Carli, sacr. liturg. prof. Brixia. 2 vols. 8vo. The chief works in ecclesiastical history, are the second volume of the works of Tizzani and Palma, mentioned in our last summary.

Dizionario Portatile de' Concilii. This work contains a summary of the acts of all general, national, and provincial councils, the reasons why they were held, their decrees on faith and discipline, and the errors condemned in them; from the Council of Jerusalem to the Council of Trent. Besides the above, a collection is given of the more remarkable canons, and a chronological table of all the councils. This edition pro-

fesses to contain some additional information not found in the French original. Large 8vo. pp. 536.

La Filosofia Vendicatrice della Religione. Del prete L. Luciano. Naples. We may have to return to this work.

BIOGRAPHY AND INSTRUCTION.

Vita del Mistico Dottore S. Giovanni della Croce, primo Carmelitano Scalzo, Coadiutore di S. Teresa nella Riforma. 4to. Treviso.

I fatti dei Santi Martiri descritti, dal Sacerdote G. Savio. 1 vol. 8vo. Mantua.

Decade di Sacri racconti dalle vite tratti de' Beati dell' Ordine servitico. Del P. Alessandro Bandiera. 12mo.

Il Mese Mariano, ossia il mese di Maggio consacrato a Maria Santissima. The devotion of the month of May forms one of the most favourite and beautiful offerings of the simple but religious people of Catholic countries to our Blessed Lady. In Belgium and Germany it has been attended with the happiest results. In Italy, it is usual to attend, each day during the month, one or two sermons in honour of the Mother of God, followed by the Benediction of the Blessed Sacrament. We have lately heard, that an Augustinian missionary endeavoured to establish the same pious custom in British India, and that his efforts were crowned with success, his little chapel being crowded not only with native Catholics, but even with English Protestant soldiers. The present work undertakes to supply the want of a book of devotions, to be used during the time in private families, as well as in the Churches, although for the latter purpose, many excellent works already exist.

Le Grandezze di Maria. Dell' Abate Duquesne. 2 vols. Naples.

Direttorio Ascetico. 2 vols. 4to. Bassano. A reprint of the excellent work of Father Scaramelli, S. J. on the method of guiding souls, by the ordinary means of divine grace, to Christian perfection.

Prediche Quaresimali. Del P. de Pederoba. 2 vols. 4to. Venice.

Quaresimale e Panegirici. Del P. Barnaba da Caprile. 1 vol. 8vo. Leghorn.

Panegirici e Sermoni. Dal Canonico Berti. 1 vol. 8vo. Leghorn. The author of this work was formerly treasurer of the Collegiat Church of Malta, and afterwards chaplain to the troops of Her Majesty in that island.

Della Utilità delle Regolari Istituzioni provata dalla Concordanza dei testi scritturali cogli statuti degli Ordini religiosi. Dal Dottore G. Nottola. 1 vol. 4to. Venice.

Opere del Teologo M. Piano. These works, which are to be comprised in three volumes, contain a series of parochial instructions on the mysteries of faith, and discourses on the Gospels.

The *Université Catholique* for June, contains :—1. Course of Social Economy (tenth lecture), by M. de Coux ; 2. Course on the Philosophy of Law (eighth lecture), by M. Ernest de Moy, professor at Munich ; 3. Course on Criminal Law (Introduction), by M. Albert du Boys ; 4. On the Connexion between Medicine and Religion (Intro-

duction), by M. Meirieu; 5. Review: Spanish Galleries at Paris; Literary Italy (third article), by M. de la Gournerie; Religion, from Documents anterior to Moses; 6. German Catholic Review,—I. History of Innocent III by Hurter, by M. l'Abbé Axinger; 7. Notices of New Books.

The number for July contains:—I. Course upon the History of Political Economy (Conclusion), by M. de Villeneuve Bargemont; 2. Course of Astronomy (eighth lecture), by M. Desdouts; 3. Course of the Monumental History of the Early Christians (thirteenth lecture); 4. Review: I. Chateaubriand's Congress of Verona, by M. de Cazalès; II. Ranke's History of the Popes, by M. Douhaire; III. Life of St. Benedict; IV. State of Religion in Austria; V. The Atheist Reconverted to Christianity; VI. Notices of New Books.

The number for August contains:—1. On the Connexion between Medicine and Religion (third lecture); 2. Course on Criminal Law (third lecture), by M. Albert du Boys; 3. Course on the History of Christian Poetry (fourth lecture), by M. Desdouts; 4. Review: I. The Armenian Religious at Venice; II. On the Punishment of Death, by M. Laimé; III. Voigt's History of Gregory VII, by M. de Combequilles; IV. Voyage to Jerusalem; V. Distribution of Prizes at the College of Juilly; Discourses of M. l'Abbé Foisset and M. Berryer; VI. Notices of New Books.

END OF VOL. V.

INDEX

TO THE

FIFTH VOLUME OF THE DUBLIN REVIEW.

- ABSENTEEISM**—the evil of, in Ireland, promoted by the union, 524.
- Absolute monarchies**—their establishment, and jurisdiction over spiritual matters, encouraged and promoted by Luther, 145.
- Absolution**—how conveyed to the penitent by the Catholic priest, 544.
- Adrian VI. pope**—his character, 18.
- Albigenses**—the war with, was the origin of the Inquisition, 74.
- Allen (Cardinal)** assisted by Sixtus V in founding the English college at Douay, 32.
- America**—not peopled from the north of Asia only, but also from southern Asia, and probably from the South Sea Islands, 188.
- Animal magnetism**—often studied out of a feeling of idle and dangerous curiosity, 416—asccribed by many to demoniacal agency, 418—means employed by the operator, and effects produced, *ibid.*
- Antwerp**—wrested by the French from Holland, and restored to Belgium, 486.
- Apostolical succession**—claimed by the Anglican church, 285.
- Aristocracy in France** might have prevented the anarchy consequent upon their flight, had they, instead of forsaking the vessel of the state, steered her in the course of reform, 314—does not, strictly speaking, exist in France, *ibid.*
- Athenian captive**—a tragedy by T. N. Talfourd, 225—displays many beauties, but is wanting in energy and depth of feeling, 229.
- Atahualpa**—The last inca of Peru, previous to the invasion of the Spaniards, slays all the members of the Imperial family, 212—consents to a conference with Pizarro, but meditates treachery, 220—he is taken prisoner, 221—and put to death after a mock trial before a tribunal of Spaniards, 223.
- Augsburg, confession of**, by the propagators of new opinions, 145—its reputation, *ibid.*—peace of, its principal articles, 148.
- Australasia**—Catholic mission in, by Dr. Ullathorne, 274—his success in reclaiming some of the most criminal among the convicts, 275—wants of the mission, 276.
- Authority**—which is divided in America and England, is contracted and centralized in France, 319.
- Banks and letters of exchange**, origin of, in the middle ages, 28.
- Brazil**—the savages of the interior formerly feasted upon human flesh, 193—its regency proposes to the pope a person to fill the see of Rio Janeiro, 240—the pope refuses to ratify the choice, *ibid.*—justified in so doing, by the avowed opinions of the party, *ibid.*—attempt to force the consent of the pope, 241—unbecoming and insulting note from the Brazilian minister to the Holy See of Sept. 1835, 342—is a copy of Lord Strangford's note to the Sublime Porte of August 1823, *ibid.*—the pope refuses to accede to the nomination, 244—appeal of the regency to the legislature for support is unsuccessful, 246—disapprobation by the diplomatic body in Rome of the Brazilian minister's note, 249—objectionable nomination to the see of Rio Janeiro withdrawn, 254.
- Belgium**—high destinies reserved for her at a future time, 465—her annexation to Holland in 1814, 468—terms of this union, 469—consent how obtained, 470—fraudulent means resorted to by Holland, 471—partiality evinced in all public appointments, 473—the revolution caused by the attempt to change the religion and the language of the people, 474—the signal given by the

- revolution of July in Paris, 477—liberality of her present constitution, 478—improvement in her resources and trade, 479—her choice of a new sovereign, 480—prudent reserve of Leopold, 481—terms of treaty proposed in June 1831, 481—accepts at the time the treaty of the 24 articles proposed by the conference in Oct. 1831, which were then rejected by Holland, 485—is justified in claiming a revisal of those terms at the present day, 486—her grievances against Holland in a financial point of view, 488—unprincipled claims of Holland, 493—they are rejected by the London conference, 493—England and France bound to protect her against Holland, 495.
- Bible—Hebrew text of the, printed for the first time, by order of pope Leo X., 144—the Catholic falsely said to be forbidden its perusal, 537—countless editions published which have been authorised by the Catholic church, *ibid.*—large portions read at all times by Catholics, as forming part of the church service, 538.
- Borromeo, St. Charles—nephew to Pope Pius IV. 23—his irreproachable life, 24.
- Brougham, Lord—the publication of his speeches, made under his sanction, 441—his character as a member of the senate, 443—his powers of oratory, *ibid.*—his speech on the Canada bill, 446—his condemnation of Sir Francis Head's conduct, as lieutenant-governor of Upper Canada, 447—his speech on the emancipation of negro apprentices, 448.
- Brown, Charles Armitage—merit of his work, on Shakespeare's autobiographical poems, 322.
- Bunsen, Chevalier—his plan of the Roman Forum, 7.
- Calendar, reformation of the, was rejected by England for two centuries, through religious hatred of the popes, 114.
- Canada bill—Lord Brougham's speech in opposition to it, 446.
- Canals and inland navigation in Ireland—their progressive improvement, 504.
- Canons of the Church are not in their nature unalterable, 293.
- Canonical institution—cases in which refused by the pope, 251.
- Carlyle, Thomas—his history of the French revolution, 349—his religious belief, 350—his leaning towards pantheism, 354—his inconsistencies, 355—his hasty censures of the Catholic religion, 356—his imperfect study of it, 358—his good qualities, 358—his graphic powers, 376.
- Catholic Church—at all periods of her greatest anxiety, religious orders have sprung up adapted to her wants, 26,—Its spiritual element isolated from any political connexion or dependence, 37—has ever rewarded talent and virtue, unchecked by a regard for aristocratic pride and pretensions, 79—a disregard of its authority means that independence of thought which gave rise to the most injurious and extravagant dreams, and worshipped them as divine, 111—falsely said to have checked the diffusion of knowledge, 144—acts of violence against it by the nobles and towns of Germany were encouraged by Luther, *ibid.*—its subjection to the supreme pontiff is the only true security for its independence, 250—misrepresentation of its real doctrines, 541—attacks upon it, however pure may be the motives, always end in the perversion of truth, 544.
- Catholic religion—its progress in Germany during the pontificate of Paul V. 34—arrested by divisions amongst the Catholics, 35—prejudices of early education against its principles and practice, 52—malicious misrepresentations of its tenets in school treatises, 54—none can fairly discuss its truth who have been taught from children to revile it, 70—all sects hold together by the common bond of protesting against it, 71—is revived in Germany through the zeal displayed by the Jesuits, 150—its present state in France, 257—in Belgium, *ibid.*—in the Austrian dominions, 259—in Bavaria, *ibid.*—in Saxony, 260—in Electoral Hesse, *ibid.*—in Schwartzenburg, *ibid.*—in Switzerland, 261—in Greece, *ibid.*—in Sweden, 262—in Prussian Poland, 263—in Russia, 265—in the United States, 268—in Nova Scotia, 269—at Algiers, 270—in Cochin-China, *ibid.*—its introduction and progress in England, 302—how vilified by those who lay claim to the most tolerant principles, 383—gross ignorance of its tenets, *ibid.*—how unrelentingly persecuted by the King of Holland, 472.
- Catholic faith, its vitality admitted by Napoleon, 357—is reviving in France at the present day, 375.
- oaths—the Bishop of Exeter's speech thereon, 459.

- Catholics—their grounds for following a divinely authorized guide, 70—penal enactments still subsisting against them in the reign of George III. 390—Sir Walter Scott's illiberal opinions respecting them, 391—should not, out of a mistaken notion of liberality, suffer their Protestant and philosophical friends to batter down their outworks, 433.
- bishop of Australasia, 277.
- institute of Great Britain—formation of, 280—resolutions adopted, *ibid.*—its design and objects, 281—approved by the Catholic bishops, 284.
- Celestial scenery—by T. Dick, 278.
- Centralization, in France—destroys all desire for local improvement, 319—its inconveniences for the frontier provinces, 322—materially advances equality, *ibid.*—its advantages, *ibid.*—gradation by which authority is delegated, 324—its utility annulled by the interference of the crown, *ibid.*—its manifest disadvantages, *ibid.*—at variance with the principles of a monarchical party, 329.
- Charles V. (Emperor)—his successes in the Low Countries and Italy, 36.
- Charles Prince (afterwards Charles I.)—his projected marriage with a Princess of Spain, how broken off, 48.
- Church property—the emperor Ferdinand's edict for its restitution, 165.
- Cicero—his definition of what an orator should be able to accomplish, 439.
- Clement VII. pope—his qualities, 19.
- VIII. pope—puts an end to the civil war in France, 33.
- Constance—council of, ended the schism caused by the removal of the Holy See to Avignon, 16.
- Colleges in Rome—established for the English and other nations, by Gregory XIII. 29.
- Commons, house of—rivalled and surpassed by the House of Lords in the display of splendid talents, 440.
- Constitutions of Spain, Portugal and Greece—failure of the attempts made to found them on a simple and undeveloped form of society, 318.
- Copernican system—we are mainly indebted for it to the pontiffs and dignitaries of Rome, 79.
- Copernicus—sought the protection of, and was encouraged in his system by the pope, 82.
- Danton—his character as portrayed by Thomas Carlyle, 375.
- Denmark, king of—assumes the command of the forces against the Emperor Ferdinand, 162—is defeated by Tilly, 163—deposes the Archbishop of Bremen, and raises his own son to that see, *ibid.*—Wallenstein's project for depositing this sovereign, 164.
- Douay—English College at, founded by Cardinal Allen, with the aid of Sixtus V. 32.
- Dramatic representation appeals, in a great degree, to the imagination, 345.
- Dublin Petition against the return of Liberal Members—attracts general attention, 125—questions raised, *ibid.*
- Review—vindication, by a portion of the Press, of the Catholic principles which it advocates, 384—in its remarks upon Sir Walter Scott and his biographer, it only aims at asserting the principles of universal toleration, and freedom of conscience, 392—it would have defended the Dissenters, if similarly attacked, 393.
- Ecclesiastical reservation in a clause of the Augsburg treaty of peace, one of the causes of the thirty years' war, 148.
- Education and Self-formation, treatise on, by Dr. Heinroth, 273.
- Election Committees appointed to try the returns of the Irish members, 116—their object, and means at their command, *ibid.*
- Elliotson, Dr.—his advocacy of mesmerism, 411.
- Emmerich, sister Ann Catherine—a religious of a convent at Dulmen—her meditations upon the dolorous passion of our Lord and Saviour, 407—her visions treated by some persons as cases of natural somnambulism, 411—cautious reserve and pious discretion of the compiler's introduction to her meditations, 425—solemn recommendation of his bishop to publish them, 426—brief account of her life, *ibid.*—her constant intercourse with the spiritual inhabitants of an invisible world, 427—she is unconscious of enjoying this favour, *ibid.*—her special miraculous vision in early life, 428—unimpeachable evidence authenticating the fact, *ibid.*—providential means by which various circumstances of her life became known, 430—her most extatic state, *ibid.*—her death, 431.
- England joins the confederation against the Emperor Ferdinand, 161—the most aristocratic nation, and least centralized government in Europe, 331—

- looks upon France as her natural ally in the war that may break out between absolutism and liberty, 465—her alleged pecuniary sacrifices for Ireland, not founded in fact, 529.
- English Corporation Bill—Lord Lyndhurst's speech in opposition to it, 452
- Episcopacy of a see, province, or kingdom—what will vitiate it, 290.
- Equality—understood in France as a removal of the distinctions between man and man, 310—materially advanced by destroying local influence, 322—forms the basis of the municipal government in its outward form, 326—its advocates have doomed to destruction all men and corporate bodies enjoying special favors and immunities, 328.
- Essays on Natural History, by Charles Waterton, Esq. 278.
- Estimates of costs of Railways are often a fallacious guide as to the probable expense, 512.
- Established Church—the archbishops and bishops of, accused of being, by favor of the civil power, intruders into the sees of the British realms, 296—rejoinder that can be urged, 297—its refutation, 298—the bishops of this church not the successors of those who held the sees until the reformation, and are therefore illegitimate holders of the same, 305—placed itself in a state of schism at the reformation, 306
- Eucharist—the power of consecrating it is constantly mixed up by Protestant writers with that of instructing and governing, 289.
- Excavations at Rome—to what extent carried on, 4—general view of them, as they at present exist, 6.
- Exeter, the bishop of (Dr. Philpotts)—his character as a member of the senate, 459—his powers of oratory, *ibid.* his speech on the Catholic Oaths, *ibid.*
- Fanaticism displays itself in its hatred of all formulas, as much as in a blind predilection for them, 356.
- Father Clement, a pretended Roman Catholic story—its misrepresentations of Catholics, 535—its sophistical arguments, 536.
- Father Rowland, a Catholic tale of North America, 554.
- Ferdinand, Emperor of Germany—his claims over his competitors, 155—his reluctance to punish the revolvers of Bohemia who fell into his hands, 156—his conduct and character misrepresented, 157—his severity provoked by the Protestants, 158—his success alarms the ancient enemies of his house, 160—engages Wallenstein in his service, 162—consents to dismiss him at the demand of the electoral princes, supported by France, 168—removes Wallenstein from the command of his army, 185—rapid success of his arms after Wallenstein's death, 186.
- Fiction, works of—would be of great advantage in attracting the minds and hearts of the young to the cause of the Catholic religion, 555.
- Finances of the Holy See—its difficulties removed by Sixtus V., 30.
- France—the natural ally of England in the war that may break out between absolutism and liberty, 465.
- French Revolution, Carlyle's History of—its merits, 359—the seeds of that event were sown at the Protestant Reformation, 360—its horrors, 369.
- people—their unbelief left them destitute of divine help, when ground down by their materialist rulers, 367.
- French and Italian Catholic Literature, 574.
- Galileo—misconceptions and mistatements of writers respecting him, 72—Disingenuousness of his biographer in regard to his condemnation, 76—his enthusiastic reception in Rome, 85—raises the mischievous and uncalled-for question of the consistency of scripture with his theory, 86—enters on a series of theological epistles, which formed the sole ground of his impeachment, 89—he is advised to confine himself to the system, without interfering with the scriptures, 90—second judicial inquiry, entered into at his own instance, *ibid.*—equitable and temperate decision of the Inquisition, 92—he bears testimony to the liberality and kindness of the cardinals, 95—his improper conduct compels the pope to summon a congregation, and condemn his proposition, *ibid.*—lenity displayed toward him, 96—his extreme intemperance was the cause of his being silenced, 97—attentions paid by the papal court to his friends, 98—the pope's kindness to him, and his ingratitude, 99—evidence of his misconduct, 100—not till then was he made to feel the hand of power, 105—his system condemned by the pope as rash, not as heretical, 107—sense in which it was styled in the sentence a heresy, 108.
- Geography, class book of—compiled for

- the use of King's College school—its account of the Reformation, 57—its malignancy and falsehoods, 58—its evil tendency, 60—its calumnious imputations against popes, 61.
- Germany, Emperors of—their opposition to the popes in the 16th century, 142.
- Geraldine—a novel, written by a late convert to the Roman Catholic religion, 534—calculated for a sincere inquirer after truth, 546—her pursuit after the truth from book to book, previously to embracing the Catholic religion, 548.
- Gibbon—his insincerity as an historian, 65.
- Gregory XIII. Pope—his edifying conduct, 29—he favors the Jesuits, and establishes colleges in Rome for the English, and other nations, 29.
- Gregory the Great, Pope—slanders and calumnies directed against him, as the alleged destroyer of the Palatine library, 64—refutation of the charge, 65.
- Grey, Earl—as a member of the senate, 456—his powers of oratory, *ibid.*—address to the House of Lords, on resigning office, 458.
- Gunpowder Plot—a scheme falsely ascribed to the Roman Catholics, 56—proved to have been undertaken in defiance of the remonstrances of Catholic priests, 57.
- Gustavus Adolphus—his victories, 37—lands in Germany with an army, 168—his character, *ibid.*—his violence towards independent princes, 172—is killed at the battle of Lutzen, 176—his death a great blessing to Germany, *ibid.*
- Hall, Capt. Basil—his notice of Sir Walter Scott at home in 1824, 401.
- History, Catechism of English, by Pinnock—its misrepresentations, 55.
- Holland—ill effects of yielding to her demands, 464—her king detested in Luxemburg and Limburg, 466—her rights to the disputed territory considered, 467—her national debt, how dealt with by the king in 1814, 468—her preponderance over Belgium, in the union between the two countries, 470—the king's persecution of the Catholic religion, 472—terms of treaty proposed in June, 1831, 481—resumes hostilities, 484—rejects the treaty of the 24 articles, 485—hopes indulged in by the king to the prejudice of Belgium, 487—he had become the principal capitalist in his kingdom, 489—particulars of his financial operations, *ibid.*—official statement of the public debt in 1829, 492—unprincipled claims set up against Belgium, 493—they are rejected by the conference, *ibid.*
- Images—degree of respect paid to them by Catholics, 543.
- Immortality of the soul—believed in by the ancient Peruvians, 214.
- Innocent X, Pope—Ranke's refutation of charges against him, 50.
- Inca—title borne by the rulers of Peru, 198.
- Inheritance—the law of, in France, has not promoted the welfare of individuals or of the country, 311—illustration of this subject by the history of a private family, 312.
- Inquisition, established in Rome in 1542, 27—principles laid down for the guidance of this tribunal, 27—groundless charges respecting it, 45—originated in the war with the Albigenses, 74—none attribute to it the privilege of infallibility, 76—the Council of Trent has taught us not to place implicit reliance on its awards, 79—its equitable and temperate decisions in the case of Galileo, 92.
- Intimidation at Irish elections—when the time arrived for preferring these charges, they were dropped, 131.
- Invisible world—the belief in its existence has been at all times a prominent feature of humanity, 408—nature of our relations with it, *ibid.*—its glories manifested, however imperfectly, through the visible world, *ibid.*—instances in which our Saviour opened its wonders to our view, 409—phenomena which accompany its private revelations, 410—it is, like the visible world, the scene of conflict between the good and the evil principle, 422—sister Emmerich's constant intercourse with its spiritual inhabitants, 427—she is unconscious of enjoying this favour, *ibid.*
- Invisible things—our corrupt nature beholds them by the special interposition of supernatural power, 410.
- Ireland—opinions of Sir Walter Scott respecting it, 395—its confidence in the present administration well founded, 397—the good intentions of its rulers defeated by the House of Lords, *ibid.*—proposed general system of railways, 496—population, 497—districts the most populous enjoy most comforts, *ibid.*—improvements created by resi-

- dent proprietors, *ibid.*—condition of the Roman Catholics in certain districts, 498—revenue in a great measure derived from taxes on whiskey and tobacco, 500—the country can only be improved by reclaiming a large portion of the people from habits of drinking, *ibid.*—increase of its imports and exports, of its revenue, and of its population in late years, 501—condition of the people not improved, 502—utility of public works, 503—M. Dupin's opinion of its former senators, 508—prejudices of England, and unfounded impressions entertained respecting the connexion between the two countries, 518—proofs of its misgovernment by England, 519—avowed discouragement of every branch of her trade which interfered with that of England, 520—gratuitous injuries done to her, 523—futility of the pretended relaxation of the commercial policy of England in her regard, 524—the pecuniary assistance claimed for her is no more than a debt due from England, 531.
- Irish people—their constancy to the true faith in the midst of trouble and persecution, a contrast with the conduct of the French people, 367—Sir W. Scott's reluctant admiration of the Irish, 398—the many evils under which a portion of them labour are the fruit of their own improvidence, 499—their ignorance of the financial affairs of their country, 530.
- Italian Catholic Literature, 582.
- James I—his alleged good intentions towards Catholics, 47—his opinions respecting the Catholic religion, *ibid.*
- Jesuits—rise and progress of—objects of the society, 26—favoured by Pope Gregory XVII, 29—injustice of the charge against them of having urged to measures of severity against Galileo, 101—their zeal revived the Catholic religion in Germany, 150—are persecuted by the Protestants, *ibid.*—reinstated in South America, 236—a society in the highest degree beneficial to mankind, 387—calumnies heaped upon them, 538—their vindication, 539.
- Julius III, Pope—endeavours to restore peace to Italy, 21—proclaimed his resolution to adhere to the principle of not mixing in political differences, 44.
- Kepler—the chair of astronomy at Bologna offered to him by the Pope, 97.
- Knowledge, diffusion of—falsely said to have been checked by the Catholic Church, 144.
- Knowles, J. S.—his comedy of *Woman's Wit, or Love's Disguises*, 225.
- Lansdowne, the Marquis of—his character as a member of the senate, 460—his powers of oratory, *ibid.*
- Learning—revival of in Italy at the end of the 14th century, 17.
- Leo X, Pope—his character and political system, 18—was the first to cause the Hebrew text of the Bible to be printed, 144.
- Letters of exchange and banks—origin of in the middle ages, 28.
- Lepanto—victory of, the result of the Pope's exertions in the cause of Christendom against the Turks, 25.
- Liberty in France, more restricted than during the proudest days of the old monarchy, 316.
- Literature, English—anti-catholic by prescription, 52.
- Loans raised by the Popes—how rendered necessary, 28.
- Lockhart, J. G. Esq.—his *Memoirs of the Life of Sir Walter Scott* creditable to his judgment and literary taste, 377—he coincides with Sir Walter's illiberal opinions respecting Catholics, 392—his frivolous account of him as a boy, 401—he has preferred the gratification of partizan hatred to conciliating all suffrages in Sir Walter Scott's favour, 407.
- Lords, the House of—rivals and surpasses the House of Commons in the display of splendid talents, 440.
- Luther, Martin—his grounds of attack against the Catholic Church, 143—encouraged the acts of violence of the nobles and towns of Germany, 144—and the establishment of absolute monarchies, and their jurisdiction over spiritual matters, 145.
- Luxembourg—its cession to Holland would expose a part of the French territory, 465—propriety of its annexation to Belgium, 484.
- Lyndhurst, Lord—his character as a member of the senate, 451—his powers of oratory, *ibid.*—his speech on the English Corporation Bill, 452—he arraigns at the close of the session of 1836 the conduct pursued by ministers, 453.
- Manco Capac—the first inca of Peru—means which he employed to rescue the

Peruvians from barbarism, 195—conjectures respecting him, *ibid.*—he established colonies, and enacted wise laws, 196.

Mansfeld, Count Ernest of—revolts against the Emperor Ferdinand, 158—fails in his attempt, and disbands his troops, 159—raises an army in England, 161—is defeated by Wallenstein, 163—his death, *ibid.*

Materialism in France at the period of the revolution, and its influence on that event, 362.

Mayo, Mr.—his advocacy of mesmerism, 412—nothing is too extravagant for his credulity, *ibid.*—arguments on which he grounds his belief, 414.

Meditations upon the dolorous passion of our Lord and Saviour, by sister Emmerich, a religious of a convent at Dulmen, 407—spirit in which they should be read, 434.

Melbourne, Lord—his character as a member of the senate, 442—his forcible reply to Lord Brougham's taunts on the subject of the Canada Bill, 443.

Mesmerism—its delusive pretensions as a science, 411—considerations into which the question resolves itself, *ibid.*—every thing credible in the accounts of its advocates is matter of common experience from natural causes, and every thing incredible is the result of deception, 413—experiments tried, and their failure, *ibid.*

Mexico—origin of its inhabitants, 188—its language different from the Peruvian, 189.

Middle classes in France—their ascendancy over the ruins of the aristocracy, how established, 314.

Mirabeau—his character as portrayed by Thomas Carlyle, 371.

Miracles, duly authenticated, are the basis upon which the Church forms her judgment when she yearly adds to the list of canonized saints, 422.

Miraculous phenomena rejected by the sceptical spirit of the age, 422.

Miscellaneous intelligence, 556.

Mission in Australasia, 274—conversions effected among the worst of convicts, 275.

Missionary societies—hail the separation of South America from the mother country, as producing a new market for their tracts, 235—are powerfully and successfully opposed by the clergy of that country, 237.

Monastic life—the delights of it cannot

be comprehended by the worldly-minded, 545.

Montalembert, the Count de—the leader of true liberalism, and foremost among the zealous defenders of the Catholic faith, 375.

Municipal government in France—its privileges too restricted to give the rural population an interest in local politics, 321—its advantages, *ibid.*—its composition, how formed, 325—outwardly based on principles of equality, 326.

National debts—system of, first introduced by the Popes, 28.

National education in Ireland—the bishop of Norwich's speech in advocacy of the system, 462.

Negro apprentices—Lord Brougham's speech advocating their emancipation, 449.

New Zealand—chiefs of, sent by the countrymen to the Catholic Bishop of Sydney for instruction, 277.

Nicea, Council of—allowed the validity of the imposition of hands on the part of a deposed bishop, but denied jurisdiction to such as thus received it, 28.

Norwich, Bishop of, (Dr. Stanley)—his character as a member of the senate, 461—his powers of oratory, *ibid.*—his speech in advocacy of the system of national education in Ireland, 462.

Nuncios of the Pope—their honourable conduct at the Council of Trent, 42.

Nun, the, a novel—its gross misrepresentation of Catholic belief and practice, 542.

Orange, the Prince of—under what circumstances raised to the throne of Holland in 1814, 467.

Orator, an—mental faculties requisite for, 437—Cicero's definition of what he should be able to accomplish, 439.

Oratory—can only find place in an advanced state of civilization, 438—in degeneracy in England of late years, *ibid.*—to what cause this may be attributed, 439.

Ordination and jurisdiction—distinction between, 288.

Owenites—advocate the principle of giving a share in the land to the whole community, 326.

Oxenstiern, Swedish Chancellor—frustrates the hopes of peace in Germany, 177—concludes an alliance between the Protestant states and Sweden, 177—his acuteness of mind, 179.

- Pantheists**—their favourite doctrine is the law of progression and mutability, 351—man, according to this doctrine, is capable of an advancing perfection upon earth, *ibid.*—its pernicious effects, *ibid.*
- Papal instructions** respecting the marriage of Prince Charles of England with a Spanish princess, 49
- Patriarchal jurisdiction**—usage determines it with a force equal to that of canons, 296.
- Paul III, Pope**—his policy, 21—brings about the opening of the Council of Trent, 21.
- Paul IV, Pope**—his firmness of character and zeal, 22—concludes peace with the Spanish general at the gates of Rome, 23.
- Paul V, Pope**—principles which guided him in his endeavours to recover the ancient rights of the Church, 33—religious orders founded during his Pontificate, 34.
- Peerage in France**—no longer hereditary, 314—is now a mere instrument of the Crown, 315—how dissimilar from that of England, *ibid.*
- Peru**—origin of its inhabitants, 188—its language different from the Mexican, 189—its state before the Spanish invasion, *ibid.*—the people formerly sacrificed human victims, 190—other monstrous atrocities to which they were addicted, 191—reclaimed from barbarism by the incas, 194—tradition respecting the means adopted, 195—Manco Capac, the first inca, 196—his successors, 200—Atahualpa, the last inca, puts to death all the members of the imperial family, 211—the Spaniards, under Pizarro, invade the country, 212—religion of the incas, *ibid.*—political institutions, 215—sciences, *ibid.*—Pizarro's rapacity and cruelties, 224—efforts of the Church to protect the Peruvians, and consequent improvement in their condition, 224.
- Petitions against Irish Liberal members** by the contributors to the Spottiswoode fund, abandoned in many instances, 122—moral effect of their result, 141
- Philosophers of the present day** ascribe to some unknown law of nature, things which are physically impossible, 410.
- Christian, pretend not to draw an exact line of demarcation between natural and supernatural causes, the Church alone having a right to determine them, 410.
- Pinnock's Catechisms**, a familiar epitome of grammar, history, science, and religion, 55.
- Pirate, the**, a romance, by Sir Walter Scott—its fine descriptions and scenes, 399.
- Pius IV, Pope**—his conciliatory disposition, 23—brings the Council of Trent to a conclusion, *ibid.*
- Pius V, Pope**—his zeal in reforming the Papal Court, 24—his severity towards non-resident bishops, 25—restores the ancient discipline of convents, *ibid.*—induces the Italian states and King of Spain to join in an expedition against the Turks, which ended in the victory of Lepanto, *ibid.*
- Pizarro invades Peru**, 212—his first expedition fruitless, 216—he perseveres, *ibid.*—founds his hopes of success on the civil war between the contending incas, 217—he advances to meet the forces of the inca Atahualpa, and invites him to a conference, 218—he attacks the inca, and takes him prisoner; brings him to trial before a tribunal of Spaniards, and puts him to death, 223—cruelties exercised towards the Peruvians, 224—efforts of the Church to protect them, and consequent improvement in their conditions, *ibid.*
- Poland, Catholics of**, persecuted by the Russian government, 266.
- Popes, history of the**, in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries, by Ranke, 14—the period of it, since the Protestant Reformation, little understood, *ibid.*—acknowledged, in the first centuries of the middle ages, to be the common father of all Christendom, *ibid.*—subsequent opposition of the emperors of Germany, *ibid.*—salutary use made by them of their temporal power, 16—cause of the spiritual opposition to them, which was followed by Luther's Reformation, 18—position assumed by their temporal power under Pius IV and V, 27—introduce the system of national debts, 28—loans raised by them, how rendered necessary, *ibid.*—necessity of their exercising temporal power to insure the free exercise of the spiritual power, 38—their virtue and piety candidly acknowledged by Ranke, 51—their encouragement of learning, arts, and sciences, 101—their right to give canonical institution is powerfully asserted by the clergy of South America, 237—differences with Brazil, 240

- dignified conduct of the Holy See, *ibid.*—proofs that they exercised patriarchal rights over the West, England included, 300—hatred of, rather than a love of God, is the real test of sanctity for a young aspirant to preferment in the state Church, 385.
- Pontifical decrees—when binding upon Catholics, 75.
- Posen, Archbishop of—his zeal in defence of the Catholic religion, 264.
- Powell, professor—his history of philosophy, his incompetency or want of candour as an historian, 83.
- Primogeniture, every institution of, has been rooted out of the civil code of France, 311.
- Propagation of the Faith, annals of the Society for, established at Lyons, published statement shewing the sums received in 1836, and their distribution, 270—the Pope's encouragement of the society, 273.
- Property—rights of succession to, rendered uniform in France, 310—its security is the basis of all national greatness, 327.
- Protestantism, progress of, arrested by Pope Sixtus V, 31—in its days were sown the seeds of the French Revolution, 360.
- Protestant writers—how inconsistent their writings against the Catholic religion, with their assertion of the right of private judgment, 61.
- Protestants cannot consistently confine their inquiry to the general question of authority, but must explore each doctrine, 71—persecute the Jesuits in Germany, 150—march against Vienna, 154—are forced to raise the siege, *ibid.*
- Prussian Poland, Catholics of, persecuted by the Prussian government, 263.
- Public works, utility of, in Ireland, 503—cannot fail to produce an annual increase of revenue, 531.
- Quito, kingdom of, subdued by the Inca of Peru, 206.
- Railways, general system of, for Ireland, 496—opposition to the plan, and calumnious charges against the commissioners, 506—refutation of those charges, 507—effects of the intended southern line on the intercourse with America, 513—extent of public aid that might be afforded, 515—system pursued in Belgium, 517.
- Ranke, Leopold—his History of the Popes in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries, 14—principles which have guided him, 37—he might have explained apparent acts of inconsistency, had he attended to the Pope's spiritual position, 40—his inaccuracies respecting Sixtus V proved from his own work, 41—other defects, *ibid.*—has written a series of sketches rather than a history, 44—instances of unfairness, 45—style of his work, 49—incorrect allusions to Roman antiquities, *ibid.*—his reputation, 49—charges against Sixtus V and Innocent X, 50—admits the piety and virtue of the Popes, 51.
- Ratisbon, Diet of, 167.
- Recollections of a Convert, 277.
- Reformation—cause of the spiritual opposition to the Popes, which led to it, 18—act of, as given in a class book of geography for the use of King's College School, 57—not caused by the publication of indulgences, or the occasional abuse of this practice, 143—its doctrines were gaining ground in Catholic Germany previous to the Thirty Years' War, 149.
- Society, satirical account of one of its meetings, 549.
- Reformed Churches—disgust excited by their history in the time of James I, 115.
- Religious orders—sprung up at periods of anxiety to the Catholic Church, 26—reinstated in South America, 236—enumeration of, in Belgium, 257—their suppression in Russia, 265.
- Resurrection of the body believed in by the ancient Peruvians, 214.
- Revelations, private—what is implied by the approbation given by the Church to the publication of them, 422—tests applied to the case of St. Bridget, 423—objections refuted, *ibid.*
- Revolution of July 1830—has retained the former social and political position of France, 329—policy of the French ministers since that event, *ibid.*—their present conduct inconsistent with former professions, 330.
- Revolutionary movements in England and in France—marked distinction between them, 315.
- Richelieu, Cardinal—his policy, 35.
- Roman Forum, description of, 1—present system, and opinions respecting it, 2—Chevalier Bunsen's plan, 7—dimensions, 8—buildings and principal monuments, 9—those ascertained are few in proportion with others which afford

- matter for endless contests and theories, 10..tabular view, 13..in what spirit should its ruins be contemplated, 14.
- Rome, capture of, by the imperial troops, during the pontificate of Clement VII, 20..peace concluded with the Spanish general by Paul IV, 23..improvements made by Sixtus V, 31.
- the Church of, may at one time signify the see of that city, at another the universal Church in communion with it, 75..Professor Whewell's attempts to accuse it of producing mental servility in science, 110..its encouragement of science and learning, 111.
- Russia..intolerance of its government towards the Catholic Church, 265.
- Sardica, Council of, deposed Gregory from the See of Alexandria, 307.
- Saxony, Electorate of, conferred by the Emperor on Duke Maurice; insincerity of the latter, 147.
- Schmalkald Confederation, 145..arose from political rather than religious grounds, 147.
- Scott (Sir W.) memoirs of his life, 377..his ambition to be the founder of a clan bearing his name, 379..when visited by misfortune endeavours to retrieve his losses, 380..his religious feelings, 382..his uncharitableness towards Catholics, 387..in politics he professed steady Tory principles, 393..his opinions respecting Ireland, 395..Autobiographical fragment composed by him in 1808, 398..his voyage with the Commissioners of Scottish Lighthouses in 1814, 399..his descriptions in *The Pirate*, *ibid.*..his store of anecdotes, 402..his description of the delights of a planter, *ibid.*..excellence of private character, 403..evidence of the tenderness of his early domestic feelings, *ibid.*..leaves England in 1831, 405..reception given to him in foreign countries, *ibid.*..description of his last moments, 406.
- Somnambulism, a word derived from the French, substituted for that of animal magnetism, 415..acts performed by persons in this state, *ibid.*..possibility of arriving at a satisfactory physical solution of it, *ibid.*..cases of the prediction of future events under its influence, 419..the only reasonable hypothesis is the intervention of evil spirits, 421.
- Shakespeare (Wm.) injury done to him by many of his commentators, 331..his alleged indigence in early life disproved, 333..his poems, 336..he was prevented by accident from being the publisher of his own works, 341..evidence of his having been in affluent circumstances, 343.
- Sixtus V. (Pope) elevated to the Papal chair at a critical period, 29..his talents, *ibid.*..succeeds in removing financial difficulties, 30..his improvements in Rome, 31..arrests the progress of Protestantism, *ibid.*..his admirable conduct respecting Henry IV and the Protestant sovereigns, 41..refutation of charges against him, 50.
- South America advised to assert its ecclesiastical freedom, 236..adheres to sound religious principles and its duty to the Holy See, *ibid.*
- Spottiswoode Fund, 116..list of returns against which petitions were presented, 120..peculiarities connected with them, *ibid.*..calumnies heaped on the liberal party, 122.
- Steam navigation to America, inquiry into its practicability, 514.
- State, interference of the, in religious matters, always injurious to the cause of religion, 251.
- Surveyors having no practical knowledge of husbandry incompetent to decide on the value of lands, 124.
- Talfourd, T. N...his tragedy of the Athenian Captive, 225.
- Taxation in Ireland..efforts made to assimilate it to the taxation in England, 532.
- Tracts for the Times..a work written by Protestant divines, with a view to revive in the Anglican Church a love of ancient principles and practice, 285..endeavours to vindicate the English Church from the accusation of schism, by quoting a decree of the Council of Ephesus securing the liberties of the Church of Cyprus, 291..false assertions upon which the argument is based, 292.
- Tradition..the authority of, 68.
- Transubstantiation..letter by the Rev. J. Fletcher, 278.
- Trent..Council of..brought about by Pope Paul III, 21..concluded by Pope Pius IV, 23..its canons, 27..its removal to Bologna, 39..honourable conduct of the Papal nuncios, 42..Protestant States invited to send deputies to it, but refuse, 147.
- Theological reasonings..men of science should keep aloof from them, leaving them to the religious world, 112.

- Thirty Years' War..its origin, 34..its signal given by the revolt of the Protestant States of Bohemia, *ibid.*
- Tilly, Baron de, 155..character vindicated by Protestant historians, 156..successes against Protestant Princes, 159..defeats the King of Denmark, 163..takes Magdeburg by assault, 170..is defeated by Gustavus Adolphus, 173..his death, 175.
- Tory Committees calculated upon for annulling the returns of many of the Liberal Irish members, 116..cases in which they succeeded, 118..instances of their judicial decisions, 132..charges of bribery found to be gross fabrications, 139.
- Vega, Garcilasso de la, 189..endeavours to justify the natives from the heavy charges of the Spaniards, *ibid.*..his account of early Peruvian history, 190.
- Visible world..called into being to manifest, however imperfectly, the glories of the invisible world, 408.
- objects..their insufficiency to satisfy the vast desires of our race, 417.
- Visions..generally shrouded in mystery, 409.
- Vision of the agony of our blessed Saviour in the Garden of Gethsemani, 434.
- Ulster..its advantages over other parts of Ireland, 499.
- Union between England and Ireland..not sought for by the Irish, 524..the evil of absenteeism promoted by it, *ibid.*..means resorted to for effecting it, 525..has made Ireland share in the payment of the English debt, 526..has removed the inequality between the debts of both countries to the prejudice of Ireland, 527.
- Université Catholique for 1838, 278-583..a monument of faith, learning, and human progress, 376.
- Wallenstein..his removal from the command of the emperor's army, 37..his early life, 162..enters the service of Austria, *ibid.*..defeats Mansfeld, 163..is created Duke of Mecklenburg, 164..his dismissal demanded, 167..recalled by the emperor, 174..again raises an army, 175..conditions required by him, *ibid.*..his success against the enemy, *ibid.*..is defeated at Lutzen by the Swedes, commanded by Gustavus Adolphus, who is killed, 176..aspires to become independent, 178..his suspicious inactivity, 180..rejoices at the success of the emperor's enemies, 182..he is removed by the emperor from his command, 185..is killed by an officer, 186.
- Wellington, the Duke of..his character and influence as a member of the senate, 442.
- Whewell, Professor..his sequel to Copernicus, 109..he attempts to accuse the Church of Rome of producing mental servility in science, 110.
- Woman's Wit, or Love's Disguises..a comedy, 225.
- Zetland..description of, in Sir Walter Scott's novel of the Pirate, 400.



